

cies, under Mr. McDermott, such funds as will be necessary to provide Alaska with whatever assistance money can provide.

I said then that although the body blow was felt by Alaska, great losses were also suffered from the tidal wave in my State and in California, that I have already asked the Governor of my State to supply me with any information he can supply me with, which may be of assistance to him in making his official request to the Federal Government for emergency assistance in my State; and that the congressional delegation will of course back him up. Some of our coastal towns, such as Florence, Depoe Bay, Waldport and others, have suffered great losses—nothing comparable, of course, to those in Anchorage and Seward, as related to us in the last hour by the senior Senator from Alaska, because our losses have been caused only by the tidal wave and not the earthquake; but to the people who have lost their all, it is just as important to them as individuals even though Alaska lost more.

This being a west coast catastrophe, I am sure the Government will do everything it can to provide as much assistance as Government can bring in such an hour of tragedy.

I wish to express, on behalf of the people of my State, our great thanks to President Johnson for the immediate assurance he has given to the country that everything within the power of the Government that can be done to bring relief to the stricken area will be provided.

I believe the two Senators from Alaska deserve our sincere thanks for giving us this on-the-scene account, because they saw the aftermath with their own eyes; and we appreciate it, although it deeply saddens us.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Even in our hour of agony, we keenly feel the plight of those in the more southerly Pacific coast areas who felt the effects of this upheaval of nature as we did.

Alaskans have the heart, the spirit, and the courage to rebuild. It will be almost a total rebuilding effort. But even imbued with all of these attributes, there is no determining whether they can succeed unless the oneness to which the Senator from Florida so eloquently referred manifests itself now, so that all Americans join together to help the people, in this instance, of my own State—as I feel sure Alaskans would wish to join were a similar catastrophe to afflict the people of any other State.

This is what makes us strong. This, in part, is what makes us great, that the American heart beats as one. We are willing to help every other American wherever he may be. There are some Americans desperately in need of help now. The Americans in Alaska declare that they can continue the big job which their country has assigned to them, to make the last frontier truly a great State of the Union. With your help, and with the help of the American people, this can be achieved in spite of that which happened last Friday.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep sympathy to the

Senators from Alaska over the tragedy which occurred in their State this weekend. Both of them may be assured that the Senate in its deliberations will do everything within its power to assist the distressed people of Alaska, as it would for other States in such an hour of tragedy and danger. We are appreciative of the firsthand report which the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has given us.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is my hope that the words of the Senator from New York, representing as he does, so many millions of Americans, may be carried swiftly to Alaska.

I yield the floor.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to a discussion of McNamara's war in South Vietnam, with the prayer that it will not become a U.S. war, although it is on its way to so becoming, I wish to express my compliments to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for the very able speeches they delivered today, laying down the affirmative position of those of us who support a strong civil rights bill. Both Senators rendered a magnificent service in presenting the overall case in chief for the affirmative side in this debate. Later, title by title, some of us will present detailed arguments in support of the various sections of the bill. However, I am very much pleased to serve under the leadership of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who will handle the substantive debate. I wish he had been as sound on the procedural aspects of the subject, last week, as he was today on the substantive aspect of it.

A finer leader than the Senator from Minnesota could not be made available to us as we battle away in support of the substantive, affirmative position we will take to pass the strongest possible civil rights bill.

I always find it a great pleasure to be in agreement with him. I am always unhappy when he does not see the light on a procedural question. Of course, I am speaking facetiously at the present time. I am glad that we are back shoulder to shoulder again, fighting together, on the substantive aspects of the civil rights issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while the Senator from Oregon may be

happy when he finds the Senator from Minnesota with him, let me assure the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from Minnesota is exceedingly happy when he finds the Senator from Oregon with him. There is no greater or stronger or more effective supporter of a piece of legislation than the Senator from Oregon. May I say, with equal candor, that when he is opposed to a piece of legislation, his strength is legion, and he puts up a brilliant battle. He is great both in offense and in defense. I am glad to be on the side of the stalwart Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate those flattering words very much, because they prove the close personal friendship which exists between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon. I wish I did not have to rebut the flattery, but I do. Kind as the words are, the fact remains that I never seem to have the votes when I am in opposition to the Senator from Minnesota. Of course, I have long since learned that having the votes does not necessarily prove one right, because other Senators may walk down a mistaken path.

However, all joshing aside, I believe it augurs well that the civil rights forces in the Senate have united and that they will be marching together for the next few weeks—how many I do not know, but as long as it takes—down the road, in a determined fight to pass the strongest possible civil rights bill.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I have consulted the leadership again today. The record should show that I have a pretty firm understanding with the leadership that during the course of the civil rights debate no unanimous-consent agreement will be granted on the floor of the Senate for any committee to hold a meeting while the Senate is in session, while I am present, and that when I am absent from the Chamber an endeavor will be made at least to give me the courtesy of a quorum call to bring me to the floor of the Senate, or, knowing my position, that the leadership will object in my behalf, as a matter of courtesy, until I can reach the floor of the Senate, and reaffirm the objection.

I have thought this problem through at great length. I know all the difficulties that confront us. I said over TV today, when I was examined about this subject, that the only conditions under which I would relax my determination not to grant a committee the right to meet while the Senate were in session would be in the case of some national calamity, some great emergency, which might arise, such as the Alaskan tragedy, when it might be necessary for a committee to meet long enough to give consideration to the presentation of the case as to how much money was needed to be appropriated in order to meet the emergency.

However, I wish to make it very clear that that does not mean that I have opened the door, so to speak, for committee meetings. Only in the case of a serious national calamity would I give consent to any committee meeting being held while the Senate was in session, and then only with the understanding that it

would be for the purpose of handling the national calamity.

I will not give consent to the Appropriations Committee to meet to report appropriation bills. I care not how much hardship might be caused by not having an appropriation bill reported. Let us face the fact, as I have said before, that the price of freedom comes high, but freedom is worth it. We are now in a great contest to deliver, for the first time since the Emancipation Proclamation, true freedom, full freedom, constitutional freedom to the Negroes of this country.

I believe the only way we shall ever deliver it is for the American people to pause long enough in their daily lives to take a look at the Senate, and to realize what is at stake here. If, as, and when the time ever comes when it is necessary to bring some urgings to bear upon Senators to vote for cloture, I want the Senate to be in the position where the American people will be prone to say, "Why do you not vote for cloture?"

I am satisfied, when the American people start asking Senators in certain States, who for some reason or other have not seen fit in years gone by to vote for cloture, "Why are you not voting for cloture?" we shall begin to get their votes for cloture.

In my judgment there is nothing more important facing this Republic, now that the issues have been drawn, than to get it behind us, after adequate debate has been guaranteed to the opposition. No one will be more determined to see to it that the opponents of civil rights have a fair opportunity for full and adequate debate.

That does not mean interminable debate. That does not mean debate that seeks to prevent a vote ever occurring on the issues. It means the time that is needed to present all the arguments on the substantive issues that are involved. I intend to see that they get that time for debate.

However, after that kind of debate has been had, I shall support cloture. That is why it is important that no other business of the Senate is transacted in the meantime, because we will not get cloture—and of this I am convinced—until the American people understand that they, too, will have to make sacrifices for the preservation of freedom in this country during this historic period.

I believe that this is the most historic period on the domestic front since 1862.

I think the issue is drawn as to whether this country will try to remain half free and half slave. There are various types of enslavement. The Negroes of America are enslaved in this Republic tonight. Let every white person face up to that ugly reality. So long as a Negro in this country does not have exactly the same rights of constitutional enjoyment that every white person has, there is no freedom for the Negro. He is enslaved. He is enslaved to the bigotry, the prejudice, and the bias under which he has suffered ever since the Great Emancipator uttered those historic words in the form of the Emancipation Proclamation a hundred years ago.

That is the issue that has been drawn. I was told on television this afternoon—

and I am sure the President will not take offense:

Mr. Senator, suppose you get a call from the President, from the White House, and he says, "It is extremely important that this committee be permitted to meet."

My reply was:

The President knows me so well that he would not waste his time by making that call. He knows what the answer would be.

So far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the die has been cast on this issue. This is one matter on which I shall not need a majority vote. I represent the people of a sovereign State. I have my parliamentary rights in the Senate. I intend to exercise them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from Oregon that I not only feel he is right in what he states in his parliamentary right, that no committee meetings will be held during the sessions of the Senate, but I say to the Senator as majority whip that when I am on the floor, his right will be protected, his position will be honored. I say this not only in the name of the senior Senator from Oregon, but I join with him in the name of the senior Senator from Minnesota. I know of no more important business than the civil rights bill.

As the Senator has said, with the exception of a great emergency that really fundamentally affects the lives of thousands of our people in great sections of our Nation, there is no reason why the Senate should not attend to the business which is before it. If it does so, it can complete it in a reasonable time.

I say to the Senator from Oregon, as he has stated to the Senate tonight, let there be extended debate, full debate, debate on every section, subsection, and title. But the difference between extended debate and a filibuster is that debate is designed to give life to legislation, and is designed to arrive at a decision, either affirmative or negative, a decision of will, yea or nay. A filibuster is designed to kill legislation, to bury it, to paralyze it. It is designed to deny the Senate the right to express its will. We wish to make that distinction perfectly clear. The proponents of this legislation intend to lay their case before the public.

We do not intend to be mute, or silent. We do not intend to be accused of filibustering if we take the time necessary to discuss the bill. We are prepared at any hour of the day to vote on any section of the bill. We are prepared at the proper time to vote on the bill itself. I know that that is the position of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I not only thank the Senator from Minnesota, but I wish to say that the announcement which the Senator from Minnesota has made in his capacity as majority whip and in his capacity as the selected floor leader on this bill, in my judgement is the most important announcement that has been made to date in connection with the civil rights bill.

It is one thing for the senior Senator from Oregon to make the announcement which he has made several times, that he will exercise his parliamentary right to block all committee meetings while the Senate is in session, subject only to a great calamity or national disaster which makes it of dire importance that a committee meet; but for the majority whip and the floor leader of the bill to make that statement is truly good news for the people of this country.

I wish to express my sincere and deep thanks to the Senator from Minnesota for the decision he has publicly announced. I happened to know that that was his position, but in my judgment, it took a great deal of courage for the Senator to stand up and serve this clear notice to the country as to what the procedure will be in the Senate with respect to committee meetings.

McNAMARA'S WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for a few minutes I shall turn my attention to McNamara's war in South Vietnam.

Last Thursday night, Defense Secretary McNamara repeated the reasons customarily given for American participation in the war in South Vietnam. He cited three principal American objectives there:

To help South Vietnam, as a member of the non-Communist world to stay that way. "The Vietnamese have asked our help," he said. "We have given it. We shall continue to give it."

Second, to prevent southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean from falling under Communist domination. He said the area has "great significance in the forward defense of the United States," and that in Communist hands, it would pose a serious threat to the security of the United States and the family of free nations to which we belong, including the subcontinent of Asia, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines.

Third, he said we are in South Vietnam to thwart Communist aims of aggression which are pursued by means of "wars of liberation," rather than by all-out, direct aggression by armies moving across national borders.

There is nothing in any one of these objectives that does not argue for use of international treaties to handle the situation instead of unilateral American action. Secretary McNamara pointed to the Geneva accords of 1954 which partitioned Indochina. Although the United States was not a signatory to them, we said we would consider them binding and would regard their violation as a threat to international peace and security.

Why, then, does not our claim that they have been violated require us to take up the issue in the United Nations? Not a whisper from the Secretary of Defense about that obligation. That is where threats to the international peace and security are supposed to be handled. They are not supposed to be handled through unilateral action on the part of the United States, Russia, or any other power in the world.

But the Secretary makes the best case of all for handling South Vietnam through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. He declares that Communist control of southeast Asia would be a threat to the area of the Indian Ocean, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. If so, then that is exactly the situation that SEATO was created for.

If the Secretary's analysis of the danger is accurate, then why have not Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand worked out with us a joint policy for intervention in South Vietnam? Yes, and Great Britain, and France. They, too, signed SEATO.

I am at a complete loss to understand how the South Vietnamese war can be a threat to their security, and yet not one of them is interested in doing anything about it.

Oh, yes. As I pointed out last Thursday, the President of the Philippines made a great public announcement the other day about how important it is for the United States to stay in South Vietnam. So I asked him in the Senate on last Thursday, and I ask him again tonight, "Mr. President of the Philippines, what about you going into South Vietnam with some Philippine troops? What about the Philippines living up to their obligations under the SEATO treaty?"

The sad fact is that not a single signatory to the SEATO treaty except the United States is in South Vietnam.

Those signatories are perfectly willing for the United States to pick up the check. The Secretary of State admits we are picking up 97 percent of it, 3 percent from South Vietnam. Those signatories to SEATO are perfectly willing to let American boys die in South Vietnam—but no Australians, no New Zealanders, no Pakistanis, no Filipinos, no Thai, no Frenchmen, and no British boys.

We could not be more wrong than we are in connection with American unilateral action in South Vietnam. Mark my words, if we continue the McNamara war in South Vietnam, along with the proposals that he is making for stepping it up, including his keeping the door open for action into North Vietnam, we shall be branded an aggressor nation.

In my judgment we do not have an iota of international law or right on our side in escalating a war into North Vietnam. But read the Secretary of Defense's speech of last Friday night. It is clever, but it is a ducking speech. It is not a forthright speech. It is full of one escape hatch after another. It offers the launching site for one trial balloon after another.

Now is the time to speak up and to make clear to the Johnson administration that if it is going to support a McNamara war in South Vietnam, and if it is going to attempt to make it a U.S. war, and if it is also going to run the risk of having the United States condemned as an aggressor nation, because of that war, the Johnson administration must be repudiated; and I speak as a Democrat, but as a patriotic American first. I speak soberly, knowing the full import of the words I have just uttered. But I say that no admin-

istration, either Democratic or Republican, can excuse the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam; and before I conclude this speech, I hope to impress on the Senate and on the administration the support I have. The senior Senator from Oregon, the junior Senator from Alaska, and other Members of Congress who have spoken out in opposition to the policies of the Johnson administration in regard to South Vietnam do not speak alone, for behind us is a public opinion represented by millions of Americans who take our position that this kind of unilateral action by the United States cannot be justified merely because it is being done by the United States. After all, the United States is not always right in regard to foreign policy; and when the United States is wrong, it should be big enough to recognize its mistake and to correct it. Certainly Secretary McNamara is dead wrong in his policies in regard to South Vietnam.

Mr. President, the historic debate in regard to South Vietnam will increase in tempo in the weeks and months immediately ahead, because we are not going to be silenced. In my nearly 20 years of service in the Senate, I have never been known to make a criticism of American foreign policy without offering an affirmative, constructive proposal to take its place. I have been making an affirmative, constructive proposal in regard to the McNamara war in South Vietnam; and I shall repeat it again tonight—although going into a little more detail; and I shall repeat it again and again across the country in the months ahead. The policy of the Johnson administration in regard to the unilateral war being conducted by the United States in South Vietnam must be stopped; and the only force that can stop it is American public opinion. I am satisfied that American public opinion will stop it, if the Johnson administration makes it necessary for American public opinion to stop it.

We had a little inkling of the latent public opinion in this country in regard to the McNamara war in South Vietnam in the Gallup poll which was released in the last day or two. We do not find an overwhelming majority of the American people waving the flag into tatters in support of the McNamara war in South Vietnam. As the American people come to learn more about the facts—and such facts have been presented to me by officers in South Vietnam, the testimony of some of whom I shall place in the Record tonight before I finish this speech—the American people by increasing millions will join with those of us who are saying to the administration, "Get out of South Vietnam. Let the processes and procedures of international law move in, and let the United States, on a unilateral basis, move out."

I point out that the SEATO signatories are not giving us support. The only reed of international law on which we can lean is the protocol agreement entered into by the signatories to SEATO when they signed the SEATO treaty. We have no other possible right in South Vietnam, and that is not much of a right

to lean on. We joined all the other SEATO signatories in entering into a mutual agreement to the effect that the area of South Vietnam was an area, of mutual concern and interest to the signatories thereto. But let us remember that South Vietnam itself is not even a member of SEATO. Of course, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, and Great Britain are willing to have the United States "go it alone"—they always are. We got a little inkling from De Gaulle, when he stated that he thinks perhaps there should be a new policy in that part of the world. But the present gross inactivity on the part of our alleged SEATO allies raises the question of whether their security is really at stake. If they believed their security to be at stake, surely they would be doing something to protect themselves. Why is it more to our advantage than to theirs to help South Vietnam?

They do not seem to be concerned about the fallacious John Foster Dulles "domino" theory, which he imposed upon American public policy some years ago, and against which I spoke out at the time. It was fallacious then; it has been fallacious ever since, and it is fallacious now—the theory that if one country in that part of the world went Communist, then, like a row of dominoes, all the rest of them would topple, one after another. However, Cambodia has already put the lie to that; and, as I said in my speech of last Thursday, other countries have done so, too—including North Vietnam, Laos, and Indonesia. Cambodia has thrown out the U.S. aid program. Cambodia has not gone Communist and its Government has stated that it does not intend to. The repudiation of the United States by Cambodia also repudiates the Dulles false domino theory.

Although, of course, we do not like to face this fact, because it is embarrassing, the great United States has had its representatives thrown out of Cambodia; a little prince of Cambodia told our representatives to get out, or else he would put them out. If the United States had tried to answer him by insisting that its representatives remain there, the United States would have had to answer him with force; and then the United States would have been in a real fix, for then it would have been charged that the United States had committed aggression against the little country of Cambodia, whose Prince said, in effect, "I am fed up with the U.S. representatives. Take your aid and get out, and stay out."

Mr. President, the United States has been engaging in some very strange operations in South Vietnam. The other day, so-called U.S. military advisers—but they were dressed in battle regalia—were caught, together with South Vietnamese forces, making a raid on a city inside Cambodia, and using fire bombs. That is rather hard to reconcile with the professions of the United States that it is a humane country. We were caught flat-footed. I have said, and repeat today, that when we can find out the operations of the CIA—the police state agency that we maintain in our country, in a supposed democracy, against all at-

tempts to find out how it operates in Asia and in other parts of the world, I am satisfied that that page of American history will be disgraceful.

In the past few hours we find the United States uttering its assurances that instructions have gone out against the use of the fire bomb. Why? Because they know very well that if we continue to be caught using it, we shall have fewer friends in the world than we have now because of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, we usually get into the kind of fix in which we now are when we follow a unilateral military course of action based upon resort to the jungle law of force instead of the rule of law, about which the American Government is so prone to prate and profess in the councils of the world.

The senior Senator from Oregon is asking for a squaring of our practices with our professions about a rule of law. We repudiate the rule of law every time we resort to unilateral military force, as we are doing in "McNamara's war" in South Vietnam.

What is my affirmative proposal? My affirmative proposal is to keep faith with and to practice the ideals professed by our Republic. We claim to be always willing to resort to the rule of law for the settlement of any dispute that threatens the peace of the world. But we stand convicted of not doing so in South Vietnam.

The Government of the United States has never asked for an extraordinary meeting of the foreign ministers of SEATO. I wonder why. Are we afraid that the foreign ministers of the countries signatory of SEATO would not go along with a plan to try to settle without military action the civil war in South Vietnam?

Are we afraid that we could not obtain support in such an extraordinary meeting of the foreign ministers of SEATO signatories for a continuation of America's support of its puppet government, which Vietnam is? The administration does not like to hear me say that, but it is true. The South Vietnamese Government is a puppet of the United States. It was brought into being primarily through the influence and power of the United States. We set up the Diem government—a tyrannical, Fascist type of government, in which human rights were nonexistent—which remained totalitarian throughout the existence of the Diem government. It was not a pretty chapter in American history.

Finally there was a coup. We became a little disillusioned with that puppet. So there was a coup, and Diem was overthrown. Now we have a new type of totalitarian government in South Vietnam, a military totalitarian government headed by a military leader, Nguyen Khanh.

Does anyone believe there are any more human rights in South Vietnam? Does any Senator believe that South Vietnam is representative of freedom? Of course not. It is a straight military dictatorship, buttressed by 15,500 American troops and \$1.5 million a day of American money. Counting the money that we

poured in to help France in that area of the world when it was a part of the French colonial dynasty—Indochina—we have spent more than \$5.5 billion of American taxpayers' money in a useless war in that part of Asia.

Mr. President, it should stop. Something tells me that the American people will stop it, Mr. McNamara to the contrary notwithstanding.

I did not see it, but several Senators have said today that they saw an hour-long television program yesterday showing a picture of the Secretary of Defense. Apparently he let his enthusiasm run away with him. In the picture he was shown promising the South Vietnamese not only support for a thousand years, if necessary, but also leaving the impression that we would give them support forever. By what right did the Secretary of Defense go over to South Vietnam to make any such pledge in behalf of the American people?

He had no such right. The American people should answer him in no uncertain terms.

Mr. President, if the Senator desires my affirmative program in greater detail, if the SEATO countries under the treaty do not want to try to reach some kind of settlement in South Vietnam that will bring to an end this costly war, I say that the signature of the Government of the United States on the United Nations Charter places upon us a clear obligation to lay before the United Nations for determination this threat to the peace of the world now arising in southeast Asia.

What is wrong with that procedure? Of course, that would be a resort to the rule of law. That would honor the charter and our signature thereto. That would give us an opportunity to call the attention of the world to those countries that are willing to support a rule of law for settling an issue that threatens the peace of the world and those countries that are not. It would take us immediately out of the latter class. It would cleanse us immediately of the great liability that is now ours. We are resorting to military action, and by resorting to military action, we are threatening the peace of a part of the world that can lead into a holocaust which could spread around the world. It would be keeping faith with our professions about believing in resort to international law rather than the jungle law of force.

There will be those, and particularly the military minded and politically minded, who believe that the way to pay respect to the American flag is to wave it into tatters. That is no way to respect the flag. There will be those who will say that the proposal is not practical. Of course it is practical, for it is always practical to try to practice one's country's ideals.

There is nothing practical about bending a political knee at the altar of political expediency, either domestic or international. We must face the fact that the United States is wrong in South Vietnam. We have followed a wrong policy. But it is never too late to substitute right for wrong.

We have decided that it is to our ad-

vantage not to call for such a resort to the rule of law because we have a vested interest in the pro-Western government there, and these other nations do not. It was, after all, a unilateral American decision to support the remnant of the Bao Dai regime, for it was Bao Dai who chose Diem to take over, after the French failure. We came in to support Diem, just as the French before us had supported Bao Dai.

I think the Secretary's first reason for U.S. intervention came closest to being the real reason, as he set it forth in his unsound speech Saturday night. He said: "The Vietnamese have asked our help. We have given it. We shall continue to give it." The Government there is our protegee. We have convinced ourselves that it is important to us for prestige purposes. But we have not convinced South Vietnam's nearest neighbors that it is important for security reasons.

Mr. President, let us not make the mistake that Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and other great colonial powers made for centuries. They lost their colonial power. Great Britain went broke. France went into a great economic decline. Finally, the people of Great Britain and of France made it clear to their governments that they wanted an end to colonial powers and policies.

Why should we be picking up the mistakes of France in Indochina? For that matter, why should we be picking up the mistakes of past colonial powers anywhere in the world?

Secretary McNamara also gave us a picture of how hopeless our task is there. In a population of 14 million, about 20,000 to 25,000 are what he calls "hard-core" guerrillas. But the Vietcong can muster forces of 60,000 to 80,000 men.

These are the so-called Communist guerrilla forces; but they are South Vietnamese. We cannot show that there are in South Vietnam any foreign troops from China, or any foreign troops from Russia, or any foreign troops from North Vietnam. The only foreign troops in South Vietnam are U.S. troops.

Mr. President does anyone believe that the rest of the world will not take note of that fact? Do Senators think that is a great credit to the United States? Do they think the rest of the world is shouting "Hallelujah" over the rationalization and propaganda of officials of our Government who are trying to alibi McNamara's war in South Vietnam—and that we are doing it to save South Vietnam from communism?

Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the people of South Vietnam would not know the difference between communism and democracy if we tried to explain it to them—and they could not care less.

They can understand what economic freedom is. They understand that if the seedbeds of the economic freedom are brought to them, the plant of political freedom will take root and grow.

I am not taking the position that we should do nothing to help the people of South Vietnam. The Senator from Oregon could probably be persuaded that

there are sound economic projects we should spend more money on to help prepare the seedbeds of economic freedom than we are now spending on so-called military aid to South Vietnam. But that would be an entirely different situation. I believe that is the way we should beat communism in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Communism in Asia cannot be beaten with bullets.

The people of southeast Asia can be brought to the cause of freedom—not overnight, and it is desirable that we not try to do it overnight, but gradually, year by year, as we give assistance to the preparation of the economic seedbeds of economic freedom, out of which will flower political freedom in due course of time.

The reason why we need joint action of a peaceful nature in South Vietnam, either through SEATO or through the United Nations, is that only in such a climate can the seedbeds of economic freedom be developed. For want of a better descriptive term, so far as my affirmative proposal to this problem is concerned, I have a suggestion if SEATO should fail. But I would not give up hope in SEATO. I would have great hopes for SEATO, because a SEATO conference would give to De Gaulle an opportunity to come forward and offer a blueprint, if he has one, to suggest how South Vietnam can be managed and administered without killing, how South Vietnam can be managed and administered on the basis of a SEATO trusteeship, or something similar to a trusteeship.

But if that could not be worked out, Mr. President, then, for want of a better descriptive term, the senior Senator from Oregon believes we ought to make a grand attempt in the United Nations to set up some form of a United Nations trusteeship in South Vietnam—not a neutral state such as Laos. Laos is a failure, in my judgment. Laos is a failure because a mistake was made in assuming that, by bringing the Communists into roughly a third of the seats of government, we would obtain co-operation. At best, under such a situation, we might hope for coexistence. But coexistence is not co-operation. Coexistence provides only the channel and the medium for the Communists to seek to undercut, undermine, “termite,” and take over. I believe it is generally agreed that the Laotian formula is not a very helpful one. But a United Nations trusteeship or quasitrusteeship would be something entirely different. If the SEATO proposal is not a success, we should make an attempt to persuade the United Nations to assume what I consider to be its clear responsibility under the charter. Whenever an area of the world is threatening the peace, the United Nations Charter calls upon the members thereof to intervene and seek to bring to an end the threat to the peace.

It is a sad thing to have to say it, but it is true, that U.S. unilateral action in South Vietnam has been standing in the way of a United Nations approach to the South Vietnam problem.

So, Mr. President (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair) in a population of 14 million, about 20,000 to 25,000 are what the Secretary of Defense calls “hardcore” guerrillas. But the Vietcong can muster forces of 60,000 to 80,000. Against them, the South Vietnamese have an army of 400,000, supported, guided, and directed by 15,500 American soldiers. Moreover, South Vietnam will soon, and for the first time, undertake military conscription to raise its forces to 450,000—the payment of which, the Secretary of Defense announces to the world, the American taxpayer will make.

By what authority?

Since when have we had a foreign policy determined by the Secretary of Defense, who announces, after a military dictator in South Vietnam says that he will institute conscription, that the United States will pay he bill?

The Secretary of Defense also needs a refresher course in the separation of powers doctrine provided for under the Constitution, which places a check in the hands of Congress upon the Executive when he proceeds to try to act unilaterally.

Despite American aid to this area, which has totaled approximately \$5.5 billion since the French first began their war in Indochina, the position of pro-Western forces there has steadily deteriorated. By 1961, it required direct U.S. military participation. In the fall of 1963, it became worsened by the political upheaval. In March of 1964, Secretary McNamara reports that the situation has “unquestionably worsened.”

What he is proposing is another Korean war effort, only this time shorn of United Nations backing. He is calling for a unilateral American Korean war, with the possibility constantly held out of expanding the fighting into North Vietnam and even into China itself.

The Secretary is quite mistaken in trying to ascribe this Asian policy to the last five Presidents. President Roosevelt did not, as the Secretary claimed, “oppose Japanese penetration in Indochina” for its own sake. Once the Pacific war was upon us in World War II, we opposed anything Japan did that aided its war effort against the United States.

President Roosevelt’s position in World War II must be measured and evaluated in terms of preparation. We were out to beat Japan. That was the position of President Roosevelt.

The Secretary also omits the basic premise of President Truman’s action in Korea: that action was a United Nations action. It was not a unilateral war undertaken by the United States in support of Syngman Rhee.

It was President Eisenhower who undertook unilateral U.S. policies to try to shore up the remnants of the colonial interests in southeast Asia. Regrettably, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have pursued that unfortunate and misguided effort.

Secretary McNamara is only presiding over the rotten fruits of that mistake of 1954. He is only trying to play a losing hand dealt the United States in 1954.

The only question is how much he is going to bet on it, and how much the American people are going to lose before we recognize our mistake and rectify it.

We are holding a losing hand. I take the position that we should get out of that gambling game. We should return to a posture which puts us in keeping with our ideals. We should return to honoring our signature to the SEATO treaty, to honoring our signature to the United Nations Charter. That is the affirmative course of action which I present tonight on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to take a few moments to invite the attention of the Senate to a cross section account of American public opinion from coast to coast, from State to State, and from all segments of the American public, from American military officials in South Vietnam—colonels, majors, captains, and lieutenants.

Last Thursday’s CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I spoke of the position of a high Marine military officer who expressed great concern and criticism of the “McNamara war” in South Vietnam, pointing out that if we are going to conduct a war in South Vietnam, we should conduct it. This high Marine officer pointed out to me—as I reported last Thursday on the floor of the Senate, and which I report again tonight as a preface to certain quotations from communications which I have received from these officers and from many Americans in all stations of life—that the operation we are conducting is doing great damage to the morale of American military personnel in South Vietnam. There is no doubt about it. All we have to do is to read a cross section of American military points of view, and the letters I am about to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pointing out that the kind of operation we are conducting does not give American military personnel in South Vietnam the ultimate in protection to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, it is one thing to send American boys in the uniform of the American military into military danger zones to risk their lives and defend the United States on the basis of the orders of their superiors, but it is another thing to send them into those danger zones without the full protection to which they are entitled as American military men.

This Marine officer and other officers have told me that, under the kind of operation we are conducting in South Vietnam, we are needlessly risking the lives of American military men by sending them into battle zones without the protection the American military has the power to give them.

That practice should stop. No Secretary of Defense can justify it. When the American people get the facts, they will stop it too.

Mr. President, these letters are available to the White House for checking on the part of any official it may wish to designate. It is obvious, as I read some of these letters—and I shall put more in the RECORD—that it would be unfair for me to put the letters in with the signatures attached. I know how the military works, and so do other Senators.

I know what would happen to these military men in many instances. Furthermore, I shall place in the RECORD letters from doctors, lawyers, bankers, corporation presidents and vice presidents, professors, teachers, farmers, and workers. I am going to place letters in the RECORD which represent a cross section of American public opinion.

I do not often do this, but I believe the American people must be guaranteed their right to petition their Government. Because so much of the press, whose representatives sit in the press gallery of the Senate, and who, of course, are subject to the rulings of their superiors—and because their superiors for weeks and weeks have concealed from the American people the facts that have been brought out on the floor of the Senate on the South Vietnam issue—I believe it all the more important that the views of those Americans be given the right to petition, as I am doing tonight by presenting a cross section of the letters for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These are but small segments of the letters I have received. I am keeping them for other Senators to read, in a separate file in my office. Senators are welcome to come and read them.

I have no intention of doing an injustice to any person who writes to me, by disclosing his name without his approval.

I wish to have the attention of the official reporters of the Senate for a moment. I do not want the addresses of these writers to be shown. I do not want their names to be shown, except in those letters in which I have left intact the names and addresses. There are some letters in this group with respect to which it is proper for me to do that. I want the official reporters to know that I want each letter, however, to show the State—merely showing whether it is from Maryland, Georgia, California, Minnesota, or Wisconsin, for example.

I want the RECORD to show the broad scope of the petition.

From time to time I shall add more letters to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the debate proceeds from week to week.

The first is a letter from a major who is located in South Vietnam. He writes:

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SEN: The Stars and Stripes has given full coverage to your views relative to the situation here in Vietnam and also your attitude toward military personnel serving in this country. May I state that within the group I am in close professional association your viewpoint is well taken. We are enclosing a clip of Secretary McNamara's speech that appeared in the same issue of the Stars and Stripes wherein we underline with disfavor the forever aspect of troop service.

Sincerely,

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Stars and Stripes discussing the speeches made by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself on the floor of the Senate, and the article on the speech made by Secretary McNamara, to which the officers take exception, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MORSE RAAPS VIETNAM POLICY, CALLS AMERICAN DEATHS MURDER

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate Tuesday that "all of South Vietnam isn't worth the life of a single American boy" and called the mounting list of U.S. troop fatalities there an issue of "murder."

MORSE made this statement in his second speech of the day on South Vietnam. His speech was interrupted once by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, who called for the immediate return of U.S. troops from Vietnam, as MORSE himself has done in a number of recent speeches.

GRUENING agreed with MORSE that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara had no authority to commit the United States to stay on in Vietnam.

GRUENING declared: "The time has come to reverse our policy of undertaking to defend areas such as South Vietnam whose people are so reluctant to defend themselves. Let us keep on, by all means, supplying them arms. Let us continue to give them the means if they wish to use them. But not our men."

"All troops should immediately be relieved of combat assignments. All military dependents should be returned at once. A return of the troops to our shores should begin."

In his earlier speech Tuesday, MORSE said McNamara and the administration "should be brought to an accounting for the waste of American blood and American money in South Vietnam."

"There is no justification for killing a single American boy," in the military action in Vietnam, MORSE said. "We have no justification for murdering a single American boy. This issue has become one of murder."

"Where are our allies while we pay 97 percent of the bill and spill American blood?" MORSE demanded. He also asked why the United States is using conventional forces in Vietnam when, if war should come, "it will be a nuclear war."

Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman earlier said the United States remains "utterly opposed" to the neutralization of Vietnam at present.

Harriman talked to reporters after a closed-door meeting on Eastern European affairs with the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Asked about Vietnam, he said he had not come to the Capitol to discuss that subject, and said it would not be proper to discuss it until after McNamara had returned from his on-the-spot survey of the situation there.

But he added: "It is obvious that neutralization now would simply mean a Communist takeover of Vietnam and we remain utterly opposed to it."

SUPPORT "NOW AND FOREVER"—McNAMARA ASSURES VIETS

HUE, REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, in a speech punctuated by applause, Wednesday promised South Vietnam full American support "now and forever" to fight Communist insurgency.

In his firmest public commitment made to Vietnam in his current tour, McNamara declared "we will supply now and in the future whatever economic aid, military training and military equipment you need to defeat your enemy, now and forever."

McNamara's remarks, which were translated to a crowd of 30,000 persons who stood in a heavy drizzle to hear him, brought loud cheering.

McNamara had flown to this ancient capital of Vietnam earlier in the day with U.S.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Vietnamese military strongman Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh and other officials.

Meanwhile, the people mostly responsible for McNamara's frequent trips to Vietnam—the Communist Vietcong guerrillas—were in action earlier in the week, American military sources reported.

In an attack on a Mekong Delta outpost Tuesday, the guerrillas killed 21 defenders, wounded 6 and captured 25 weapons. A total of 15 defenders were missing after action was over. No guerrilla casualties were reported.

In Washington, the Air Force identified Col. Thomas M. Hergert as the missing pilot of a plane which crashed in South Vietnam on Sunday. The colonel's wife lives in Saigon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I received a telegram from the vice president of Armour & Co., which reads:

MONTCLAIR, N.J., March 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE C. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the only man making any sense out of the Vietnam situation. Keep talking and maybe someone will listen.

WILLIAM C. GRAHAM,
Vice President.

I have before me a letter which I received from Saigon, South Vietnam, which reads:

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you in regard to the waste here in Vietnam and what should be done about it. In my estimation the biggest waste here is that of dependents living in what is supposed to be a war area. These dependents live here at not only great expense to the Government but also at my personal expense.

Previously, I have been detailed to guard duty on the dependent's school on my off-duty time. I have been informed that from now on I will be having this guard duty during my on-duty time.

The point that I am trying to bring out here is that these people are not only living here at great expense to the taxpayer but now their safeguarding is putting an extra burden on the low ranking enlisted man and interrupting his normal duties which I am told are very essential.

I was trained for 8 months and given a top secret security clearance at the Army Security Agency Training Center and School. The cost of this training and clearance, I was told, ran into several thousands of dollars. Now it seems that our mission here is actually one of minimum importance.

It is my desire to find out if we as Americans are here doing an important and useful job or are we here to give our officers and their dependents a luxurious life and at the same time train people like myself to be their domestic help.

It was my desire upon entering the Army to do a needed job for my country, not to babysit for my so-called superiors' children. It appalls me to look around and see this waste.

I would appreciate your correspondence on this matter.

I have letters not only from colonels, majors, and captains, but I have had a most interesting one—and I do not seem to be able to put my finger on it—from a sergeant. I may find it before I finish my speech. It is highly critical of McNamara's war in South Vietnam.

I have a letter here from Little Rock, which reads:

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with you 100 percent about our boys being murdered in Vietnam. I do not think the U.S. Government has a moral right to send my grandson into such a situation or any other one's boys. The whole deal will end up like Korea, so let's get out now. I hope you pour it on the ones responsible until you get the United States out.

Thanks,

This is a letter from New York, which reads:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you highly on your statements concerning foreign aid, addressed to the Senate on March 4, 1964.

We loudly applaud your position concerning withdrawal of troops from Vietnam and your appeal for a new appraisal of our southeast Asian policy. May your influence grow and affect other leaders in our Nation in changing our sterile policy involving continuous military aid. It is our hope that our Government might soon come to consider reasonable negotiation, perhaps neutralization in Vietnam and begin with the withdrawal of our forces.

Our best wishes to you and congratulations on your courage and fresh views.

Yours very truly,

This is a letter which I received from California. It reads:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: I have just read with interest the enclosed article relative to your viewpoint on South Vietnam. More power to you.

In the same paper I saw the enclosed picture and article covering the return of the body of this young—20 years—soldier. It's heartbreaking to say the least. Yet, he's only one of hundreds already killed and many thousands more in the future if we continue such a futile solution.

Show this picture to Mr. McNamara and any others who think as he does and ask him to take the place of this youngster's parents—for just a moment of reflection.

Thanks for your continued good efforts.

Sincerely,

"McNAMARA 'ALIBIS' ON VIETNAM NOT JUSTIFIED"—MORSE

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, accused Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara today of making "unjustified alibis" about the need for continued U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam.

Morse made the charge on the Senate floor while McNamara was briefing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on America's military commitment in South Vietnam. Morse is a member of the committee, but boycotted the briefing.

McNamara stirred a storm yesterday in the House Foreign Affairs Committee while testifying on the need for President Johnson's proposed \$3.4 billion foreign aid bill.

Sources said he told the closed session that the \$1 billion military aid request in the bill is \$400 million short of what military leaders feel is really needed.

Morse, who favors withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam, said he would reply on Monday to a major speech McNamara is scheduled to give tonight on Vietnam.

ONE BILLION DOLLAR LIMIT

The administration asked \$2.4 billion for economic aid and McNamara said legislative leaders had made it "crystal clear" that \$1 billion was the limit for arms aid.

Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, headed by Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, couldn't believe their ears. Many said they were shocked and worried—even "appalled."

They urged McNamara to come up with a new figure that would do the full job. Later, at the closed hearing, he said the "optimum" or best amount would be \$1.4 billion. But he said the administration still was requesting only \$1 billion and was studying ways to meet the deficiencies.

NARROW MARGIN

Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Republican, of Michigan, said: "Certainly, the Congress is not going to be working on a narrow margin with 16,000 American boys in Vietnam."

Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California, commented angrily, "What do we have to do—wait until after the election?"

Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey, said McNamara had a duty to report to Congress what was really needed "even if we don't listen."

McNamara said he had warned Congress last year about the adverse effects of cuts in military aid but it didn't do any good. The lawmakers slashed his request last year by \$405 million to a final total of \$1 billion.

McNamara said the slash last year caused "absolute chaos" in arms assistance planning and millions of war items had to be canceled.

To avoid that happening, he said, the administration decided to ask this year for only what it thought Congress would vote.

LOS ANGELES SOLDIER HERO HOME TO LAST REST

(By Harry Tessel)

Pfc. Frank J. Holguin, 20, came home from Vietnam today—to rest forever in a soldier's grave.

Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes wrote his family: "Your son served his Nation with courage and honor."

Frank's grieving mother, Mrs. Anita Holguin, said: "Today, my son. Tomorrow, someone else's. My heart goes out to all the other mothers."

Her son was born in West Los Angeles and was raised at the family home, 11747 Darling-ton Avenue.

He was a tailgunner in an Army helicopter shot down by enemy gunfire on March 15.

Frank's sister, Mrs. Norma Arujo, 31, told the Herald-Examiner:

"It was especially heartbreaking because we got a letter from Frank the day after receiving word he was killed."

"The letter was to my mother and father."

"We were so looking forward to Frank's coming home on leave. He was halfway around the world—and this had to happen."

"Now, he is coming home to rest."

Rosary for Frank Holguin, son of Modesto and Anita Holguin, will be recited at 7 p.m., Monday, at the Pierce Brothers Mortuary in Santa Monica, 1307 Seventh Street.

Requiem mass will be celebrated at 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, at St. Sebastian Church in West Los Angeles. Interment with full military honors will be at Holy Cross Cemetery.

That letter was from Huntington Park, Calif. This one is from Los Angeles:

MARCH 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit a resident of another State to congratulate you on your

forthright statements regarding our position in South Vietnam.

I certainly agree with you that we should get out—and completely—of that unhappy country.

This war is not in our national interest and our involvement only threatens a larger world conflict.

I hope you are able to win backing for your position. Opposition voices to our military adventures seem lost in the Government these days—and you are indeed to be commended for your courage and foresight.

Sincerely yours,

This is a letter which I received from Oregon:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I just want to let you know I fully agree with your stand on South Vietnam, and on the entire foreign-aid program.

I have suspicions that many higher ups in the present administration, possibly even the President, are now preparing the public for our actual participation in the fighting in South Vietnam soon after the election. As far as I am concerned, South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American. It is foolish to think that China can possibly offer a military threat to the United States within the foreseeable future.

Our entire foreign-aid program is the greatest fiasco the world has ever seen. Possibly a little real help to a few deserving, but for the most part an encouragement of dictators, bribery, despotism, and discouragement of real progress. We have not gained a single friend and have turned many against us.

With best wishes.
Sincerely,

I have been advised today by one of the leading correspondents to be on the lookout for a subtle move at the Pentagon directed toward getting into South Vietnam, by the use of American guerrilla fighters, by one pretext or another. The Pentagon denies it.

I serve notice on the Pentagon through this speech that I have received this information from sources that I think are sufficiently reliable so that I intend to watchdog the Pentagon day by day for a constant check on its maneuvers. I warn the Pentagon that I would not advise it to engage in any secret maneuvers which would send American guerrilla fighters into South Vietnam.

The next letter is from Portland, Oreg.:

MARCH 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you re your views on Rusk. He is worse than McCarthy ever was.

There's already been too many American boys killed in Vietnam; and for what?

Keep up your good work on trying to get foreign aid reduced.

I can't see where foreign aid has made, or kept us any allies; the one thing it has done is to tax the American people for more than they should be taxed.

Very truly yours,

The next letter is from Washington, D.C.

6360

Mrs. MIRIAM LEVIN,
March 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, thank you, thank you, for the speech you gave in the Senate on March 25, calling for the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. You made me proud to be an American.

Enclosed is a letter I sent to my Senators, Congressman, the President, and newspapers. Good luck and keep up the good work. With sincere good wishes,

MIRIAM LEVIN.

Mrs. MIRIAM LEVIN,
March 28, 1964.

President LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am writing to ask you to use all your influence to see to it that there is an immediate withdrawal of our military forces from South Vietnam.

I have seen on the television screen pictures of napalm bombs which come from our country, being used to burn out any village in which they suspect guerrillas may be hiding. In addition to napalm, we supply a phosphorous explosive, fired from artillery and also from fighter bombers which erupts in a white cloud, burning through everything it touches. I protest this brutality and killing because it is wrong and this kind of horror has never solved any problems and does not win a war.

Just why are we there? Does Vietnam belong to us? It is not possible that there is a legitimate revolution of the people going on there. The Government now in South Vietnam was not elected by the people and does not represent them. South Vietnam has known nothing but tyranny for the last 10 years, yet we insist on a policy of non-interference in everything but fighting.

Are we killing women and children to contain China? Is this the reason we are being so immoral. Rotten means never justified any ends and we will lose moral leadership in the eyes of the world if we continue a senseless war.

A negotiated settlement by all countries concerned is the best solution, and this negotiation cannot be settled without mainland China.

The American people will support you President Johnson, if you go to them and ask for support for reconvening the Geneva powers—the countries, including the People's Republic of China, which settled the French Indochina war in 1954, to plan the demilitarization and neutralization of the whole southeast Asia area.

With sincere good wishes,

MIRIAM LEVIN.

The next letter is from New Milford, N.J.:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations for your continuing criticism of our involvement in the war in South Vietnam.

Your words "close to aggression" seemed particularly appropriate because I feel that many people (American and otherwise) feel that we are continuing where the French left off.

In my opinion our actions in Vietnam represent anticommunism at its most hysterical extreme. If there were clear-cut issues of right and wrong there might be some justifications for our tremendous expenditures in money, materials and blood.

I, for one, object to American participation in the bombing of villages and jungles because they are labeled "Communist controlled."

The people of Vietnam have suffered war too long.

Our efforts should be exerted toward ceasing the conflict and not attempting to accomplish total victory.

Keep up your good work on this subject, sir. You have the support of many people.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

P.S.—I have submitted a letter which will be published in our local Bergen County newspaper advocating support for your position.

Thank you.

The next letter is from San Antonio, Tex.:

MARCH 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for your stand on the matter of Secretary McNamara telling the world what the United States will do in Vietnam or any other place.

We think it is time the U.S. Senate starts running the country again and not give over all their authority to the President, the Supreme Court, and the State Department.

Thank you for the consideration. I hope you see it my way.

The next letter is from Los Angeles, Calif.:

MARCH 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I congratulate you for your urging to withdraw our boys from Vietnam, and I hope you'll keep on working until they come home.

The next letter is from California:
MARCH 25, 1964.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The sanity and realism in your today's foreign policy speech, pertaining to Cuba, Panama, and Vietnam will inevitably touch off a flood of hateful repercussions against you from the war hawks' quarters. Because of it, as my own "rebuttal" to those almost certain attacks on you, I am herewith registering my own reaction to what you said, and telling you of my almost complete agreement with the views you so eloquently and forcefully expressed.

The point on which we differ is that of Vietnam, situated on another continent than ours and on the other side of the world. Everyone conversant with what is going on in the world, is fully aware that we are not there for defense of the United States, but to protect the selfish interests of greedy corporations and individuals who seem to think that they have a natural right to spread themselves, like a gigantic octopus, over the entire earth.

In my opinion, all American troops and their equipment should be promptly removed from Asia, and its people henceforth be left to fight to a finish their own internal affairs, without our unsolicited and unappreciated so-called assistance.

I expressed this opinion in a letter to President Johnson just the other day, a copy of which is herewith being enclosed to yourself.

Sincerely yours,

The next letter is from Minnesota:

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: My heartiest congratulations on your stand on Cuba and Panama. We need more men like you in the Senate and House to stand up and be counted for what is clearly right and which has been a

shame in our foreign relations for too many years. Your numbers are growing and I have been pleased when I wrote to other representatives in Congress, such as Senator McGOVERN, of South Dakota, to find that their favorable mail far outweighed the unfavorable.

The only thing wrong with your stand is that you did not go far enough, and I mean in regard to our policy on Vietnam. There is a general opinion that to withdraw from Vietnam would occasion a great outcry among the American people. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The only people who are interested in maintaining the war in Vietnam are the industrialists and munition makers who are reaping a rich harvest and a few politicians who are keeping themselves in office by fooling the public into believing that we are wanted and are necessary there. The American people generally are sick and tired of our being in one perpetual war some place or other and maintaining a huge army that is expensive, completely unnecessary and a disgrace to the world. The only outcry you are going to hear is from the boys in service who, if this outrage of compulsory military training is not soon stopped, are going to rise up in wrath and make the present Negro uprising look like a Sunday school picnic. I have a son who was drafted last May and he tells me that resentment among draftees is a hundred percent and that the young men of this country are sick and tired of being told they must suffer and die for a freedom that they themselves have been denied. The reason why you fellows in Congress do not hear more about this is because the public has been arm twisted into believing that any report against it just leads to further harassment of the fellow who has been drafted by threats of fines and imprisonment. All right, if we live in a free country and if we cannot appeal to our elected representatives without being called malingerers, Communists, fellow travelers, and dupes of the Communist conspiracy, then it's about time some of us got up on our own two feet and told the world we have become exactly what we are supposed to be fighting against. I, personally, do not see much difference between being dictated to from Washington or Moscow. And this, by the way, is exactly what the Communists have always predicted for us.

If there is anything to the rumor that you may be a future Secretary of State it would be a move in the right direction. What we have there now and what we have had for the past three administrations is what has led us into the present mess we are in. If the President could be assured by the American people that a change there and in the Department of Defense would be to the happiness of the voting public I am sure he would make that change. As a former Republican I can speak for myself and many others who have left the party of the far right. As matters stand now, President Johnson is very popular. The shoutings of the Goldwaters, Rockefellers, and Nixons will avail them nothing. It's a lot of noise and that's all. The voices of the men like Senator MORSE, Senator McGOVERN, and Senator MANSFIELD, and now your own, are the voices the vote is listening to between now and November. This town I live in is an old Republican stronghold, it went Republican along with Maine and Vermont in 1936, yet today I hear much praise of President Johnson. I heard a man who has voted Republican all his life say last week that what we needed in Congress right now is a few like Senator MORSE. Johnson is far more popular here than Kennedy ever was. His speeches on peace have been very well received. The American people long for peace and it is the American people who are going to elect a President next fall, not the munition makers.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senators MORSE and MANSFIELD. MCGOVERN already knows what I think, so do the two U.S. Senators from Minnesota, who are fine men and could be in far higher posts in the Government than they are now. I honestly believe that all you fellows need down there in Washington is a few letters like this to assure you that the American people in the vast majority are with you in speeches like you made yesterday. The Government in Washington has lost touch with the people. When I tell my neighbors and friends to write to their Senators and Representatives they shrink away and say that it won't do any good anyway, that you will do just as you please. I know that that is not true. How can you represent us if you do not know what we think? Why, if we really live in a free country, have we no right to make our wishes known? If we have come to this, then I, for one, am ready to leave. My ancestors pioneered and fought and died for this country. If I cannot now make my voice heard, if I am to be called names because I do not go along with the deadly conformity of the average citizen, then I will pack up and go to Canada or some other place where a citizen has not only a right, but a duty to speak out.

As for you, and the men like you in Congress, keep on with your views and your speeches, if the people must be led, let them be led right. And you are right. You are right on Panama and on Cuba. You could be even more right on Vietnam. Why put off the inevitable? As we have done in Cuba and Panama. Let's face it now and by the time November rolls around there will be so many other things to think about that Vietnam will be forgotten.

Sincerely yours,

The next letter is from Illinois:

MARCH 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to commend you for your courageous stand on Vietnam. I just heard Edward P. Morgan comment on your speech to the effect that it amounts to aggression what our Government is doing in South Vietnam, and that we should get out of there.

I wholeheartedly agree with you.

Most respectfully,

P.S.—Please send me a copy of your speech.

The next letter is from Florida:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this occasion to thank you and congratulate you for your statements of March 11 in re South Vietnam and our foreign relations situation in general.

In my opinion you are and have been correct in all of your opinions and the American people can be glad there are a few at least in our Congress who think correctly.

Keep up the good work.

Wishing you continued good health and success in your efforts.

Sincerely,

The next letter is from Michigan:

MARCH 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just another, I'm sure, expression of appreciation for your fine speech of March 4 on foreign aid and its relation to South Vietnam. Congratulations and more power to you.

Respectfully yours,

The next letter is from New York:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Let me commend you on your forthright and realistic stand with regards to American foreign policy in Vietnam. It goes without saying that yours is a voice in a wilderness of impractical, costly and dangerous solutions to a thankless situation in southeast Asia.

I am writing also to Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, who, like you, supports the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, and to my Senators from New York State urging them to support any debate, discussion or legislative proposal that would cease the bloody and meaningless loss of innocent civilians and American lives in Vietnam. What price is any American victory if it means a possibility of greater military commitment, support of unpopular regimes, greater financial burdens and the spreading of war?

As President Johnson so appropriately stated yesterday in his speech to the AFL-CIO, general war is impossible and our objective must be the "quest for peace." The United States should strive for solutions to world problems by action which befits the greatest power in the world. These problems cannot be solved by brute force as some people so glibly and unthinkingly suggest. Our approach must be based on reason and restraint.

Your continued support of a realistic policy toward Vietnam is most important in our great deliberative assembly where the marine callers and superpatriots so often upset a sober and reasoned approach to our country's problems.

Sincerely yours,

The next is a letter from Pennsylvania:

MARCH 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We receive the Eugene Register-Guard here, and were very pleased to read your forthright statements on the need for the United States to get out of Vietnam. I checked back through the New York Times of about the same period, and am disappointed that they make no mention of your brave statements.

I am enclosing a second, stronger letter to President Johnson based on political arguments. Thought it might interest you.

Sincerely,

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As in the Korean war, we again stand "on the brink" in Vietnam.

This was a policy promulgated by John Foster Dulles and it cost us heavily in American lives and American funds. It stands as one of the bloodiest wars in history. Poor Mr. Truman was stuck with that war and could not figure out any honorable solution short of pouring more American boys and more American arms into the caldron.

The weight of public protest during the Korean war encouraged General Eisenhower, then a presidential candidate to promise thorough reevaluation of our policy. This resulted in the end of that conflict.

Now it seems to me, Mr. President, that you face a somewhat parallel situation in history. By not taking a bold and dramatic step to stop the war through negotiation right now, you run the considerable risk of having a Republican candidate ride into the Office of the Presidency, just as Mr. Eisenhower did. (And let me add that stopping the war in Korea stands as the greatest contribution of the Eisenhower administration.)

I know that you are fully aware of this possibility, and for that reason you would like to hold the status quo in Vietnam. Keeping Cabot Lodge in Saigon is certainly a good way to operate in a bipartisan foreign policy. However, there is no guarantee that we can keep this issue "on ice" for 6 months and get you safely elected before you can do a real job of reappraisal.

As a Democrat who works at the precinct level, it simply does not make sense to me to let the Republicans have Vietnam as an issue in November, while we fool around with an outmoded foreign policy invented by John Foster Dulles. Aside from that, a decade has passed since "brinkmanship" was invented, and we may have to face the facts of life, as Walter Lippmann has stated, that the whole world simply will not necessarily conform to what we would like it to be. With nuclear arms about, escalation of any war is a dangerous game. We may be called upon to agree that there is room for diversity in the world as Mr. Kennedy pointed out.

As reports from the State Department have often appeared to be conflicting and contrary to the facts as presented by the press, I urge you to take into consideration the views of Senator MORSE, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator GRUENING, Senator BARTLETT, and others who oppose escalation of the war in Vietnam and favor an honorable and peaceful negotiation by all countries concerned.

Sincerely,

The next letter is from New York:

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Once again I take the time to commend you for your remarks on the American press which is concealing from the American people the true facts as to why American boys are being sent to their death in South Vietnam.

Please send me copies of Senator GRUENING's two speeches which you mentioned in your remarks in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13. Thank you.

Sincerely,

The next letter is from Oregon:

MARCH 13, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Glad to hear of your remarks in the Senate re Vietnam last Wednesday. I would appreciate it if someone on your staff could send me speeches you have made, and any other proposals by BARTLETT, GRUENING, or MANSFIELD which pertain to Vietnam. We are considering running an ad here, and need more background information.

I'm wondering if anyone of stature has made some concrete proposals on alternatives in Vietnam—the kind of neutralization we might seek. While I tend to agree with you in an earlier statement you made that it is hard to see how the populace could suffer much more under communism than they did under the Diem regime, I also believe that we should look for a solution that will not mean surrender, but that will allow us some opportunity for nonmilitary aid and contact. We can't force any people into freedom—but we may encourage growth in that direction if we're willing to work with them, as equals, side by side. I'm afraid I have more faith in the Peace Corps at this point in history, than in the Air Corps.

Enclosed is marred copy of letter to White House commending your position. Maybe they'll tabulate it or something.

6362

My cheers and support for all your many efforts in a wide variety of directions.
Sincerely,

MARCH 11, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I see my Senator, Wayne Morse (I think he's the greatest, of course) called today for withdrawal of American forces in Vietnam. I haven't seen his speech, and don't know what alternatives he proposed—but surely we can be actively exploring possibilities for neutralization of the area. Perhaps, after our experience over Laos, we can find our way to a better solution under firmer international controls.

Surely such a settlement would be in our best interests. Continued spending of American lives in support of a dictatorship utterly distasteful to most of us, seems a tragic waste. We, who are interested in building peace in the world, and putting an end to war, should surely be interested in taking new steps toward the building of international law and peacekeeping machinery in this ugly situation.

Then, too, it is in peace that the institutions of democracy can best grow. I doubt even the most loyal South Vietnamese are learning much about the real virtues of our system from either our guns or our professional military men. Teachers, doctors, technicians and Peace Corpsmen with some basic understanding of our civilian institutions could do far more to help the villagers find a viable alternative to communism, than any number of napalm bombs.

I have found most of your policies and proposals to date, sir, sound and exciting, and I am quickly becoming an enthusiastic supporter. Our present policy in Vietnam—and the utterly repugnant talk about invasion of the north—however, seems completely out of character. Our posture there surely is winning none of the "noncommitted" peoples to our support. Here we are cast in the role of tyrants, shoring up a reactionary regime, and apparently seeking to hinder social change rather than to direct it in positive channels.

We need surrender nothing in the area. We need only look for positive and peaceful solutions in keeping with great aims and heritage of our own society.

Sincerely,

The next letter is from Oregon:

MARCH 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I congratulate you on your speech of March 4 urging the United States to get out of Vietnam and your overall appraisal of China's position.

Since I was in the District of Columbia at that time I did not hear of any publicity on your speech in the Oregon press and do not know whether there was any.

If you could send me a copy of your full statement as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would thank you. I have seen only an abridgment from I. F. Stone's weekly which justifies itself at times, despite its own brand of bias.

With best wishes,

The next letter is from Oregon:

MARCH 14, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your newsletters reach me regularly, a service I greatly appreciate.

Your stand on the issues confronting the Congress usually is endorsed by me and I was especially pleased with your stand in

regard to our policy in South Vietnam, and with the speech you made in the Senate on this vital issue. We are using men and arms and huge sums of money in a situation which is, in my view, a hopeless one and I endorse the policy of withdrawal as stated both by yourself and by Senator GRUENING.

In regard to the medicare bill which will be financed through social security and which is now pending in the Congress, I respectfully urge that it be passed. Even in its greatly amended form it will be at least a step forward.

Yours truly,

The next letter is from Oregon:

MARCH 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep fighting to bring American invasion in South Vietnam to a quick end. Good luck.

The next letters are from Oregon:

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There certainly must be something wrong in our State Department's foreign policy. The U.S. prestige around the world was never at such a low ebb, as at the present time.

We read where our flag has been torn down and trampled on, our Embassy's private property damaged and destroyed in numerous countries around the world—where we have been insulted and told "Yankee go home" after all the aid we have given them and still continue to do so.

For example Panama—we still continue giving them aid after all the insults and armed assaults on our citizens and after breaking off diplomatic relations. A person sure begins to wonder about Communist infiltration in our State Department when we look at the record.

And about Vietnam—we never can win the war there under present conditions—we have our men over there with instructions not to shoot at the enemy unless they are shot at first. How silly. We should either be willing to go all out, or give them the "works" or else get out and leave them alone—the French couldn't win over there and neither can we under our present setup—we are just pouring our money down a rathole.

Enclosed clippings describe my sentiments about our present administration on our foreign aid and diplomacy, and I am sure there are millions of Americans with the same opinion.

Imagine giving aid to such a worthless scoundrel as Sukarno of Indonesia and helping him to take over Dutch West New Guinea. How can anyone understand such a foreign policy or diplomacy? I wouldn't be surprised we end up by giving Panama the canal. Nothing our State Department does would surprise me any more. It's disgusting.

Yours truly,

JANUARY 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am deeply concerned with our policy of supporting any country whose leader says they are against communism, but who is really a dictator, and does not believe in democracy. An example I have in mind is Gen. Francisco Franco, who has been a dictator in Spain since 1936. We give him \$350 million per year. I believe this is a pure waste of money.

I appreciate your strong comments in Congress on this subject. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. President, I submit for printing in the RECORD sundry additional letters and telegrams, with notations as to the States of origin.

From Washington D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is good to see you putting the facts about the Vietnam war into the RECORD and trying to get a change in our policy in that area. There is no excuse for this interference by the United States in the affairs of southeast Asia, or for the deaths, torture, napalm, etc., that accompany our arrogant partisanship.

Do you have your speeches in form for distribution? If so, I should like to get copies for myself and several friends.

Sincerely,

From Maryland:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have today read a few excerpts of a speech you delivered to the Senate the other day on our foreign policy in Vietnam.

I wish to commend you for your upright condemnation of our actions in Vietnam. One of my sons was in Korea during our war there and I certainly do not want my other two sons sent to Vietnam.

I am opposed to the killing of our manhood and the draining of our resources in the quest of an incomprehensible, so-called democracy, which starts out by supporting and backing dictators all over Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. We need a little more democracy (especially economic) at home, before volunteering to force it on the Asians.

I would appreciate your sending me Senator GRUENING's as well as your speech regarding Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

From Kansas:

DEAR SIR: I have just read an article concerning your feelings about having our men in South Vietnam. God bless you.

My husband is stationed in Da Nang—and I know he is doing a good job—but it sure does seem hopeless. That whole affair over there seems like a waste of men and money. We are only doing half a job. So why start? We need more decision. Hope is fine, but inspection tours and news conferences never won a war. If we are going to win, let's fight. My husband is a man with 17 years' experience in the Air Force and I am proud of this, but he is on a wild goose chase right now I think. Ulcers aren't healed by hope alone—and the whole of southeast Asia is an ulcer on the face of the earth.

Another subject that I think is worth your consideration is social security for widows. A woman who loses her husband has to wait 'til she is 62 before receiving any benefits—even if her husband had been receiving social security benefits before his death. This can be a considerable hardship on the widow and I believe this area of social security could benefit from study.

With every good wish for your health I am
Yours very respectfully,

From Georgia:

Senator MORSE and MEMBERS OF THE SENATE.

DEAR SIRS: A few days ago I read in the news of your and others opposition to our boys being kept in Vietnam.

I, like hundreds of others agree that there is no justification in having them placed as a target, for the Communists. Please let them fight their own war. So much money is being spent, and our American boys are losing their lives in a country that is so far away, where we can't win if we tried.

My son is there flying a helicopter in the delta, and only under God's care has he escaped.

My family knows what war means, my father, an uncle in World War I, my husband in World War II, and now my son in constant danger every time he flies. Can't you do something please? My son's wife and little son need him as so many others need their father, but they are doing a job for their country, can't we do something for them?

If this war paid off, I guess it would be different, but the struggle in Vietnam is an old one, and will be, for a long time I am afraid.

He has a little son, 8 months old, and she (his wife) doesn't know how bad he is wounded, he was struck in the head.

Thanking you for your time, I am just an anxious mother.

Respectfully yours,

From Florida:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read a report of your speech to the Senate as printed in St. Petersburg Independent, March 11. I want to say that there are thousands of Americans who will heartily support your stand on this Vietnam mess. I hope you will continue to keep this position before the people.

Respectfully yours,

From Washington, D.C.:

MY DEAR AND BELOVED SENATOR MORSE: Your continued assertions on the withdrawal of military in Vietnam is welcomed by peace movement throughout the country. We have much to do before this view will be accepted by the administration. First of all many of your colleagues, such as Senators HUMPHREY, FULBRIGHT, SYMINGTON, JAVITS, KEATING, PELL, MCGOVERN must also speak up for international negotiations now at the U.N. and at Geneva. We have waited long enough before sitting down to the conference table. What chance is there for peace or for the U.N. if we do not use it when war comes? Negotiate or perish.

There are really many alternatives to the present situation. But the Senate will have to speak loud and clear to all papers, to the White House, and State and Defense Departments. Once again a foreign government is going to run our policy like Nationalist China, Germany, Cuban exiles, etc. Please do not allow them to get away with this again. It is not in our interest, in Vietnamese interest to continue the war. I fully agree with you. Only ask that you not let up your assault and gain other supporters—MANSFIELD should again speak, BARTLETT, KEATING, GRUENING and should call at White House to protest present plans to carry on guerrilla actions against North. This would have reverse effect—it would give Ho a chance to really invade.

Writing many others around Capitol.

We will have peace soon.

Keep it up.

With love, respect, confidence, then we have to get to Chinese representation which is essential for developing a world community and then question of NATO—good or bad?

From Wisconsin:

PROVOST RESIDENCE,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for taking the fine stand in regard to Vietnam. We don't want to sacrifice American boys there anymore. What can we do to stop it? Sincerely,

P.S.—I have a son in the Marine Corps.

From New York:

HONORABLE SIR: We agree wholeheartedly with your views of South Vietnam. That our boys have no right to die on foreign soil for an unjust cause and an undeclared war. Let the United Nations take over.

Please continue to fight for justice and against involvement.

From Kansas:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I see by the newspaper that you are and have been opposed to having American troops in Vietnam and I want to congratulate you on this matter. I, too, am opposed to it and have been ever since this business started. All of Vietnam is not worth the life of one American boy.

Keep up the good work in this connection and maybe our boys can all come home soon.

One other subject: I would like to ask your consideration—it is social security for all widows, regardless of their age.

My husband passed away very suddenly 2½ years ago (heart attack). At the time of his death he was 75. I am 20 years his junior—now being in my 58th year. I must wait until I am 62 at least before I can collect on his social security. He had paid from the day social security began. This does not seem fair to me; just because I am younger than he.

When this bill comes up again for consideration I wish you would consider all widows who are left alone. Maybe we cannot all go to work and if we can, it would be almost impossible to earn enough to bring our social security up to the amount we would be entitled to from our husband's earnings.

And also what we pay into social security from our lower earnings goes by the board and is lost when we choose the greater amount from our husbands' earnings.

I hope I have made myself clear and you can see your way to trying to remedy this situation.

In the meantime, keep up the good fight on Vietnam.

Thanking you most sincerely for reading this letter and with very kind regards, I am,
Respectfully,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your speech of March 5 to the Senate regarding Vietnam. It was very important and urgent. We are all very much concerned about the turn of events in South Vietnam.

I have written to the President urging him to find better ways of adjudicating the conflict.

It is my feeling that you and other serious minded Senators should do a study on ways and means of settling the conflict.

Isn't it naive to think that we can win a war (which as you say) in a far-off land and which will mean no victory—it will be intervention. Better let us be the "peace-makers." I think we are already too dangerously deep already.

Thank you for all you efforts to save our country from infamy and our children from death.

Most respectfully,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just heard over the radio that you demanded in the Senate that the United States get out of South Vietnam, stop slaughtering American boys.

Bravo, I say. We have no business there, and can't win this unpopular war—97 per-

cent of the Vietnam people are against the United States and the Saigon military junta.

We who are informed know that the "Vietcong" are the millions of little people they—who hate the United States and the Saigon government.

Anyone with brains knows that a U.S. attack on North Vietnam will involve China, and anyone who thinks the United States can attack China without the U.S.S.R. getting in is crazy.

The United States has a sad penchant for always getting into wars against the masses of the people. Can't we say goodbye to Singman Rees, Chiang Kai-sheks, Batistas, Francos, and such scum?

Sincerely,

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When, several days ago, I read in the papers that you were demanding the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, I addressed a letter to the New York Times, copy of which I enclose herewith.

Needless to say, I have today received a rejection notice from the Times.

I am one of the signatories of the "Open Letter to President Kennedy on Ending the War and Making Peace in Vietnam" which was run as a paid advertisement last spring. You might be interested that we received requests from over 600 individuals and organizations, asking for reprints of this open letter and through these, we distributed more than 20,000.

I believe you will be interested in this evidence of a strong opposition, throughout the United States, to our Government's policy in Vietnam. From correspondence with many of these people who distributed our open letter, I know that this opposition has grown and is continuing to grow since last spring. I continually receive letters asking us when we are going to repeat this expression of the opinion of the people of the United States against the war in Vietnam.

With respect and admiration,

From New York:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily congratulate you on your courageous stand on the issue of American involvement in Vietnam. I agree that we should have never gone in—and now that we are involved, we should leave. I am sure that there are many Americans who applaud your actions and who will support you and others who will fight for freedom and justice even if you are alone, or are few.

Again, keep up the good work. We don't want more American boys dying in southeast Asia—we want them home.

Sincerely yours,

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are so right about our position regarding Vietnam.

That whole damned stinking southeast Asia is not worth the life of one American boy.

Also we should give more aid to the people in Kentucky (coal miners) and one hell of a lot less to other countries around the world.

Yours,

From Minnesota:

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations and support for your courageous action in denouncing our dirty

March 30

6364

war in South Vietnam thus striving to restore peace and our country's humanity.

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your sensible position on Vietnam.

Bravo.

MARCH 14, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I applaud wholeheartedly your recent speech on Vietnam. Yours is the voice of sanity and commonsense and brings a ray of light to an otherwise hopeless situation. Let us hope more and more people will listen and take heed before the deeply dangerous game turns us all to ashes.

Yours faithfully,

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Wife and I were very happy to read about your efforts to stop this Vietnam madness. Why haven't we got more Senators like you?

The McNamaras, Taylors, and others advocating atomic war should read past and recent history.

They are heading for disaster not only to themselves and all the things we hold dear, but to the whole world and human race.

In 1905 when I landed from Turkey, the United States of America was the most democratic, nonmilitaristic country on earth. Now I can't recognize it.

It beats even the red sultan's doings. Of course, the sultan never claimed to be a Democrat. He was an absolute monarch, and his word was law. He had millions of Christian rebellious subjects bent on revolution and insurrection, and to some extent he was justified in his oppressive methods.

But we are invading and fighting peoples thousands of miles from our shore that never did us any harm; that want to be friendly and trade on equal terms as we asked old King George to permit us to do in 1776.

When he sent the redcoats and German mercenaries, we rebelled. Why should we be surprised if now those oppressed people do what we did? The British called us rebels and hung us. We call them Communists and are shooting them down by the thousands. Now is the time to stop this madness, before we are engulfed in a global atomic war, wanted only by big monopolies and moneybags, and sadists, and merchants of death. Do the American people want that? No. I challenge them to put to the vote of the people. They don't dare. You are a Senator and can fight. I can only write letters. When in Turkey I joined the guerrillas, fought the Turks, and we chased them out of the Balkans in 1912. Here we have the ballot and constitutional democratic government. But it is failing us in this crisis that may decide our fate and the fate of the human race.

Respectfully,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Building,
 Washington.

DEAR SENATOR: It was with much pleasure that I read in the Oakland Tribune a résumé of what you told the Foreign Relations Committee recently regarding South Vietnam.

You are right, we should never have gone there; those people were entitled to an election within 2 years after the French removal but our Government moved right in disregarding their rights and all promises.

It has cost us millions of dollars and what are we getting in return? We are getting nowhere fast.

Please keep up your good work. The people of our country will be with you strong. Your voice will be a mighty force which put a halt to this terrible business.

Very sincerely,

From Florida:

MARCH 11, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As constituents of yours for many years it is inconceivable to us, just as to what this administration is doing in Vietnam (South). You are to be congratulated on your upright and fearless statement on this vital subject and the shocking waste of American blood and money in South Vietnam has been a mystery to millions in this country of ours. Just what else but murder and how true your statement that "All of South Vietnam is not worth the blood of one American boy."

We most certainly need more good men like Senator WAYNE MORSE to awake this country to some of our foreign policy, that does not make sense.

With kind regards and best wishes we are,
 Sincerely,

From Wisconsin:

MARCH 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: In Vietnam we are fighting a war which we have practically no chance of winning in the foreseeable future, due to the fact that those who are supposed to be fighting the Communist are concerned mostly with military coups and local politics. The result will be neutralism. In Cambodia we are insulted and even our money aid is refused, and we are asked to guarantee their neutrality—this we cannot do constitutionally—might we do it anyway?

The British tell us to our teeth that regardless of our former help and friendship, that they will take care of themselves first in trade relations with Cuba, and will sell buses or any other merchandise as they wish. In other words, regardless of friendship or the danger of Communist penetration that they regard the money (from trade) as more important. Without our aid, the British would have been defeated in both World Wars. They also are actively trading with Red Russia and Communist China.

The French also tell us to go hang, and are actively promoting neutralism in southeast Asia, where they collapsed after the Second World War. They are now recognizing China (Red) which is trying to take over all of Asia—and also trying to influence much of Africa. De Gaulle also now intends to enter into Latin American affairs with a lot of talk but probably will not furnish any cash assistance worth mentioning. He also fancies himself as arbiter of much of Africa although his country did not have much success there. He is apparently trying to make up for four military defeats since the Napoleonic era. In two of these wars, the United States, with bloody sacrifices, rescued France from under the German heel.

Pakistan has turned from friendship with the United States to cooperation with Red China, and has established air communication with China from new airfields for the building of which we provided the funds. This was mostly because we assisted India to resist invasion from Red China, and Pakistan resented the buildup of India's military forces.

It is about time we reassessed the situation and started on a course of action that will be of some benefit to this country for a change. The only answer is to scrap all our former ideas on military and economic aid and begin all over again with a program that will be effective and accomplish our

aims. So far, our well intentioned efforts have missed fire and engendered more ill will than thanks. When Cuba and Panama can successfully defy us and make us look in the eyes of the world, it is time to pause and take another look.

Some of the former foreign aid could well be turned into needed domestic aid to eliminate excessive unemployment, to assist in general and adult or vocational education, and to fight unnecessary poverty.

Sincerely,

From New York:

MARCH 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although not one of your constituents, I am writing to express my admiration of your courageous and wholly accurate statements concerning our policy in Vietnam. I read the report of your statements in March 21 New York Times, almost side-by-side with the news of the Vietnamese (with U.S. military participation) attack on a Cambodian village just as negotiations between Cambodia and South Vietnam were to commence. Are we determined to precipitate a major conflict? There would seem to be no security, military or moral purposes to be served by our continued participation in the Vietnamese situation, and the vast sums of money spent for that purpose could be more effectively employed in a meaningful attack upon poverty here at home.

A convening of the Geneva Powers for the purpose of negotiating peace and a workable situation within Vietnam would be a real contribution to the cause of world peace.

Respectfully yours,

From New Jersey:

MARCH 23, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE:

I applaud your fight for our withdrawal from South Vietnam.

Yours is a timely and courageous position and is in the best interests of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

From the State of Texas:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday, I was shocked to read, in a Salt Lake Newspaper, that Secretary of State Dean Rusk considered anyone who did not agree with our country's foreign policy a "quitter." I thought this was a free country. One in which it was possible to express an honest opinion.

To my mind the State Department is the "quitter." Every time Russia or any other country (no matter how small) takes an aggressive action against us, we back up and think of ways of appeasing them. If we took a firm stand, other countries would respect us.

Your remarks with reference to Secretary Rusk's statements pleased me. A clipping from a Salt Lake paper is enclosed.

You cannot buy friends either as a country or an individual. It is now time for other countries to support themselves.

Sincerely,

From Florida:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE T. MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: The writer listened with interest and appreciation to your television comment this week on the subject of our foreign aid program. You stated your position on this matter forthrightly and with simplicity.

Because of your concern over the economics and expenditures of our Nation, I am taking the liberty to enclose an article which I clipped from a Baptist weekly bulletin. I am sure you will find it interesting.

Very truly yours,

From New York State:

MARCH 22, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please accept our expression of appreciation for your comments on South Vietnam made in the Senate March 4.

Humanity, commonsense, and political intelligence all make our immediate withdrawal an imperative. It is frightening to consider that up to now so few voices have been raised against a bloody and self-defeating policy; frightening in that the American public seems to accept passively whatever rosy pictures are painted for it by our leaders and the mass media.

May we request that you continue your notable efforts toward effecting a speedy withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam?

Yours very truly,

MARCH 21, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter to President Johnson on the subject of our policy in Vietnam.

Please accept my support in your search for alternatives to the present impasse in that country.

The decision of Secretary Rusk to label critics of his policy "quitters" does not seem to me to serve the interests of our Nation, the Democratic Party, or working democracy in this country.

Your courage is appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

MARCH 21, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a moment when it appears that our policy in Vietnam is to become a matter of public debate, may I add my voice to those who oppose an escalation of the war, and seek a satisfactory termination to our involvement in that country.

According to reporter John D. Morris in the New York Times this morning, we have now spent nearly \$3 billion in military and economic aid in South Vietnam, after nearly 9 years of involvement. The prospects for a termination of guerrilla war in that country seem poor, given the terrain, the apparent unwillingness of the Vietnamese to commit themselves to their own defense, and the direct interest of Communist China in fomenting the guerrilla war.

I know that you are interested in widespread public support for the program of your administration, and I have wholeheartedly supported your domestic policy in the area of civil rights and the war against poverty. Eventually, it seems to me that public support will have to be developed for the policy of a negotiated peace in Vietnam, if the Democratic Party is to avoid the stigma of appeasement. I do not understand why Secretary of State Rusk should label critics of our present policy "quitters," since this pins the interests of our country and the fortunes of the Democratic Party to the

maintenance of our present stance in Vietnam.

As a concerned citizen, I voice to you my misgivings about the escalation of the war through military strikes closer to the frontier of China. Under the circumstances, the neutralization of North and South Vietnam, supported by international guarantees, seems the more reasonable policy to pursue.

Respectfully yours,

From the State of California:

MARCH 21, 1964.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: We hope that you will give more weight to the sound opinions of Senators ERNEST GRUENING and WAYNE MORSE than to the rash commitments of Secretary of Defense McNamara for unlimited aid to the present Vietnamese rulers, who do not represent the people.

We believe that you should recall our troops from Vietnam in favor of neutralization and demilitarization of the whole southeast Asia area. The United States is losing moral leadership in the world by continuing this brutal and futile war.

As lifelong Democrats, we favor letting the Republicans campaign as war-whoopers while we demonstrate in this crucial pre-election period that we are for peace.

Cordially yours,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Above is a copy of the letter we sent to the President after reading about your fine statements regarding the situation in Vietnam.

Gratefully,

From Nebraska:

MARCH 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a wish to congratulate you on your stand, in disagreeing with our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk on the foreign aid program, and on South Vietnam.

Personally, I feel that we kicked China, as well as Cuba, into Russia's lap; that there would be no Communist China today, were it not for our State Department trying to save some of our vested interests there. Before World War I we had a like rumpus with Mexico over the oilfield at Tampico. However, this one fizzled, and Mexico went ahead with their nationalization.

The smartest move President Eisenhower ever made was when campaigning over in Iowa, he stated, "If I am elected President, I'll bring the boys home from Korea." This one statement did more to elect him than any other move in his election. Somewhat the same thing could happen in the coming election in regard to South Vietnam.

When our vested interests leave our shores to accumulate their fortunes in a foreign country, they should become citizens of that country, and not expect Uncle Sam to send the marines down to pull their marbles from the fire.

Russia today is offering more incentives than this country in many lines—they are digressing from some of their originals in their thinking. While in our country, our free enterprise system is falling on their faces if it were not for the constant help from the Government Treasury. We just cannot stand on our own individual feet.

I think you are aware of this, and Senator, more power to you.

Yours truly,

From the State of Ohio:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORSE: Three cheers for you that we should stay out of South

Vietnam. How right you are that the white man has never conquered that area. I as a mother am weary of stewing about our boys going in service. In fact, I am very much for abolishing it or at least cutting the length of time down. I can well remember when we had no such thing and so why not again? War brings nothing but debts and heartaches, and having a fiancée that was killed in service how well I know. I am also happy that you feel as you do about this parochial aid to schools, again why? It is the church that wants it so let them kick in.

Sincerely,

From the State of New York:

MARCH 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The reports from South Vietnam have been contradictory and misleading, both from Mr. Lodge and Mr. McNamara. It is shameful that American soldiers are in South Vietnam supporting one rotten dictatorial regime after another. Without our support these regimes could not have survived.

If we wish to prevent the South Vietnamese from becoming Communists, burning their villages, poisoning their food crops, and putting the peasants into concentration camps will not incline them toward American democracy. We are doing everything we can to make them hate and fear us.

I hope our Government is not misguided enough to attempt to carry the war into North Vietnam, and to use nuclear weapons. This brinkmanship is a dangerous and criminal policy.

Your speech on March 4, of which I read excerpts was a gleam of hope and sanity in a mad situation. I hope your efforts to restore us to sanity will continue and will be effective.

Sincerely,

An Anxious and Ashamed American
Citizen.

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just want to thank you for your magnificent speech in the Senate. Stop the killing in South Vietnam. Bring the boys home.

I just wrote the President urging him to end the bloodshed.

Keep up the good work. Small wars can easily become big ones and from them nobody is going to survive.

Again my thanks.

Sincerely,

From Wisconsin:

March 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Let me commend you for the courageous stand you are taking on the Vietnam situation. Also for calling it just what it is: Murder.

I would like to know the names of other Senators and legislators who are supporting you on your stand.

Respectfully yours,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I fully endorse your thoughts on South Vietnam.

Please keep up fighting until you succeed to get our Government agencies to stop this dirty war and the honor of our country.

Respectfully yours,

6366

From Minnesota:

MARCH 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree heartily with your statement before the Senate on March 4, that the U.S. unilateral participation in the South Vietnam war cannot be justified. I feel that we have no moral right to be engaged in that civil conflict and that the practical reasons our Government gives for our involvement seem absurd.

Please send me a copy of your March 4 address.

Very truly yours,

From Florida:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my support of your position concerning Vietnam. I am shocked at Secretary of State Rusk. Up to a month ago I believed he was an excellent Secretary of State, never giving vent to invective like Acheson or to preaching like Dulles. This calm seemingly reasoning person suffering frustration now indulges in accusation which raises questions as to his abilities.

Senator MORSE, I admire your guts. I wish you long residence on Capitol Hill. I wish you would join more strongly in support of Senator CLARK in his attempt to democratize the Senate.

Can you send me copies of your speech on Vietnam or Panama and on disarmament? Neutralization is an answer to our problem. De Gaulle has worthwhile ideas. I used to dislike the old boy. But he has been successful.

Sincerely,

From California:

MARCH 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I support your contention that we must withdraw our forces from South Vietnam.

Yours truly,

P.S.—I've also written the President and Secretaries of State and Defense.

The following letters from Oregon:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express some views on some subjects and present a question or two.

I think the foreign aid program should be continued to the most deserving countries but under very close supervision by Americans on the spot. It seems that at present some of these countries are holding an ax over our head; and if we don't give them money, they will go Communist. I say, if they don't want to take our money under our supervision, let them go elsewhere.

As an old retired Navy man, who had several tours in the Panama Canal Zone, I think it would be a gross mistake to give up control of the zone to anyone; least of all the Panamanians. The equipment, etc., would be out of commission and the shops looted within 6 months. What they had left, Castro agents would take care of after that. There are just too many fanatics in this little country to handle so vital a channel.

I think the Communists should be allowed to buy all of our wheat and any other non-strategic items, but they should pay cash on the line for them. If they have to spend cash for food, maybe they won't have quite so much left for rockets and Castro-type ventures.

If the U.S. gold outflow is our big worry, why aren't some brakes applied to the large movie companies who spend millions in every

country of the world for labor and materials when we have the old unemployment problem etc., here at home? Wouldn't some high import duties on these films help solve this?

How many Russians have been killed in Vietnam getting those people there who are Communists to fight for their cause as compared to the Americans who have been killed getting them to fight for the American-sponsored cause?

It has been said that we have a hard time getting those people to fight for their cause, and it is costly in American lives, but why haven't we heard of the cost in Russian lives or whoever is supposedly forcing the other side to fight. Or, are we sponsoring Vietnamese against the other Vietnamese who disagree with us. If this question is confusing, believe me, it's clear compared to the situation as I see it in Vietnam.

What's more confusing is why we have all that modern equipment and thousands of men plus a million dollars a day expended there and the Vietcong has bushmen and old outdated equipment, and we seem to be getting nowhere. If an outfit like the Cong will fight that vigorously against those kind of odds, they must be fighting for a better cause than what we are saddled with there. How and who can inspire the Cong to fight against these odds, when we are supposed to have so much to offer the other side? Are we supporting a small minority group that really doesn't agree with us at heart?

Currently I'm for:

1. Civil rights, slowly in the South.
2. A tax cut, of course.
3. Old-age medicare.
4. For our State, a sales tax, excluding food.

I want to congratulate you on the job you are doing for Oregon and the country alike. Your judgment on subjects in the past has been interesting and sound. I like your sound thinking before action, and action when the need is urgent.

Very sincerely,

MARCH 7, 1963.

Senator MORSE: You have taken some very principled stands on a lot of things. Please take one more and support Senator MANSFIELD on a change of our policies in Vietnam. I am very fearful of what may happen if the war is extended north.

Sincerely yours,

From Pennsylvania:

DEAR SIR: May God bless you, Senator MORSE, for laying the facts on the line concerning our rather dubious involvement in South Vietnam.

The saber rattlers here and in South Vietnam may "have their day" but in waging a callous, inhuman nuclear war, the moral fiber of this entire Nation will be rendered void.

On the other hand, anything short of nuclear or atomic involvement would spell catastrophe, also.

Dr. Bernard B. Fall, in his book "The Street Without Joy," claims that our military advisers are beset with the same vices that befell French union forces in this area. Granted this is true, how can this great Nation expect to come out any better than the French?

Senator MORSE, you, along with Senators CLARK, CASE, and one or two others are facing the grave issues of the day foursquare.

The following from Oregon:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on Vietnam is the only positive voice I have heard for preventing an undeclared war and the loss of more lives. What has happened to our other Senator?

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When you were here in Oregon last week I had Erna Hains, of Berkeley, here at our house. She is a member of the National Board of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and was here to give our local chapter some information about the seminar in Washington on February 7-9. I believe you know her. She was lavish in her praise of Oregon's congressional delegation. We are truly proud of you all.)

When I was free to call you it was too late and I had so many questions to ask about a lot of things, too. But for this time I will say that we here in Oregon are deeply disturbed over the terrible situation we are in in Vietnam. I know you have been very critical of our military aid in many places, now others are becoming alarmed and maybe something can be done about it.

Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, and Senator MANSFIELD are alarmed. It seems to me that most of the nations are opposed to our course of action there, too. Is there anything an ordinary citizen can do about it?

I am writing to the President and to Secretary Rusk asking that a negotiated settlement be undertaken. I hope you will support the position that WILPF takes on this issue.

Congratulations on your talk to the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

Thank you and sincerely yours,

From North Carolina:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am an old resident of Eugene, and you may remember that I met you several times in Washington at Oregon meetings and at the alumni luncheon of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces where you made such an outstanding speech. Some of the alumni who came to scoff remained to pray.

The most refreshing thing I have read for a long time is Allen and Scott's column which appeared in the local Asheville morning paper yesterday with an account of your remarks on South Vietnam in a private conference between Secretary Rusk and the Foreign Relations Committee. What we are doing now may be all right, but it has the look of a creeping involvement which may drag us into disaster. As the Chinese grow stronger we may be practically certain that they will expand their efforts throughout southeast Asia.

Enclosed find a copy of a short article recently published by me. The latter part, dealing with southeast Asia, is much in harmony with your ideas.

With warmest regards, I am,
Cordially yours,

The following from Oregon:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This Sunday evening we have seen the films on television of the overthrow of the Diem government in South Vietnam.

I believe this is good evidence of the hypocrisy of the United States trying to save countries like this from communism. For the life of me, I cannot see how we can continue to support messes like this all over the world. The new Government in South Vietnam will be just as corrupt and tyrannical as the Diem regime.

Those were American guns, American-made uniforms, American trucks, American-made helmets, and other equipment furnished by us on the men that we saw shooting at each other. I can see no honor in this revolution for us Americans, and we are going to start shelling out for these people just like we did for Diem.

You have proclaimed that you are going to see that more effective use is made of money going for foreign aid. You have my permission to stop it all. American soldiers have no business being in Vietnam at all. Let's try letting these other people fight their own battles.

Yours very truly,

MARCH 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Offices,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was heartening to have you speak out against the remarks of Secretary McNamara. Why should these men be committing us to such a futile war and assuming foreign policy direction?

Now the French lived and ruled among these people for years and with good soldiers and knowledge of the language they were forced to get out. Do we think we are more adept in dealing with these inscrutable orientals?

After careful reading of Pearson's and Anderson's book as well as Lederer's "Nation of Sheep," I am convinced we seem to act like babies in the woods. Evidently these natives resent our throwing our weight around and our dollar diplomacy. This communism bogey may help some politicians get elected but they might better delegate their efforts to our own grave problems which are mounting.

Thank you for speaking out against this action as well as much of foreign aid.

Very sincerely,

From Missouri:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your statement relative to the proposed foreign aid request this morning was telecast on television in which you made known your opposition and your reasons why, including our "mess" in Southeast Asia.

As an ordinary citizen, who desires to keep the United States a country to be proud of, I wish to express my congratulations to you for having the courage to speak out against such nonsense and impracticable programs and also being just as courageous for fighting for the proper ones. The people in this section agree with your views overwhelmingly.

Please do not take the time to reply to this letter as I know you are busy.

Respectfully,

From Oregon:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a native Oregonian, born in Marshfield 69 years ago, a World War I veteran, also a retired locomotive engineer, was on the Portland division for nearly 45 years, worked out of Eugene a lot of the time, Southern Pacific Railroad.

I am not in the habit of writing letters to city, county, State, or Federal politicians, in fact this is my first attempt, now that I am a pensioner I get time to read a lot, and there are some things I cannot understand and would like to get your opinion.

I have been reading about South Vietnam and I cannot understand why they have our boys fighting and getting killed over there, in my opinion that dirty, stinking country and the people in it are not worth one good American boy. Let the Commies have it, it would be a good thing for this country, they cannot feed or govern themselves and if China took over they would have just that many more people to care for and the cost would be so great that China would crumble from the extra burden.

After all the aid the United States has given to Vietnam, they are in a worse mess today than when we started, let us stop.

Look at the money that has been sent out of this country as foreign aid and what do we get for it, a kick in the pants and a stab

in the back whenever they get a chance to do it, if we had kept the money at home we would have no need to start a war on poverty, there would be none.

The tax cut bill has passed and it is written as it should be, those that need it the least got the biggest cut, those who need it most got the least, and increased prices will get it all and maybe more, but one good thing about the bill is, the big oil operators get to keep their depletion allowance, and that will keep them from being poverty stricken so the President will not have as many poverty cases to war on.

I am a registered Democrat and have been for years, but in general election I vote for who I think is the best man, I even voted for you when you were a Republican candidate and have voted for you ever since, because you are one of the too few good men in Washington. I think you are honest and vote as you think will do the most good for our country and you are not afraid to speak out on any legislation on any person that the Senate has to act on. Senator I think we should keep our missionaries at home, from what I have read about Washington, D.C., they could use a lot of them there, officials advise women not to go out alone after dark, they could be robbed, raped, or murdered, and that in the Capital of our country and we the most enlightened country in the world. Have we?

Hope I can vote for you for many years to come.

Sincerely,

From New York State:

MARCH 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your statement to Secretary of State Rusk in regard to Vietnam. We should get out and now and I hope there will be many more as sane voices as yours.

I am writing President Johnson to this effect.

Yours truly,

From Pennsylvania:

MARCH 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your speech in Senate on March 4 re Vietnam—at least the excerpts I have just read in I. F. Stone's Weekly.

Thank goodness someone is talking some sense on this problem.

Respectfully,

From Massachusetts:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The American people owe you an unspeakable debt for your farsighted and forthright statement in the Senate on March 4, calling for the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam and especially warning against our extending the war into North Vietnam. Our utterly unjustifiable meddling in Vietnam, in dishonorable violation of our pledge to respect the 1954 Geneva agreement, has brought our country to the brink of catastrophe and horror, which could well escalate into nuclear cataclysm if we permit an attack on North Vietnam.

You may be interested to see a copy of the letter which I recently wrote to the President.

I beg you to continue this fight unrelentingly, and all the American people except the small proportion of maniacal right, will back you up.

With profound gratitude for your courage and statesmanship.

Sincerely yours,

P.S. I should be very happy to receive a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your full speech, or any other copy of the speech, if it is available.

MARCH 5, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am aghast at recent suggestions that your administration is contemplating enlarging the Vietnam war by extending it to North Vietnam through raids, bombardments, or blockade.

The charge that the guerrillas get their arms from North Vietnam is, on its face, preposterous, since the main fighting is in the Mekong Delta 600 miles to the south, with government forces in the intervening area. Actually, the guerrillas are now fighting chiefly with American arms captured by them in raids or brought over by the tens of thousands of defectors from the government troops.

To use this arms excuse for an attack on North Vietnam would be sheer madness. China is pledged to come to the support of North Vietnam if attacked (remember Korea?), which would insure a bloodier and longer drawn-out war, with U.S. troops becoming more and more involved and thousands upon thousands of American boys dying, even as the French Army of 200,000 (plus 200,000 Vietnamese) died for 7 long years and met utter defeat at the end. Is this a policy any sane government would adopt?

An attack on North Vietnam and Chinese involvement could even escalate into the final nuclear holocaust, for the U.S.S.R. has recently clearly warned us (New York Times, Mar. 1) that they "might not stand idly by if the United States took direct military action against North Vietnam or Communist China."

Surely in the face of these realities no one but the most insane militarist clique of the Pentagon could contemplate attacking, directly or indirectly, North Vietnam, especially since we have open to us an immediate, honorable, and peaceful solution of the Vietnam situation; namely, to put into operation the Geneva agreement of 1954—which we officially pledged to respect—to stop the fighting, withdraw our Armed Forces, and arrange for the holding of nationwide elections for a democratic, neutral, unified Vietnam. I beg you to adopt this policy of sanity and peace.

Sincerely yours,

From California:

FEBRUARY 18, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you not to ask for anything for myself, on the contrary, I am writing to pass some information and views on so you can evaluate and consider them for whatever they are worth. Sitting here on duty in South Vietnam as I am, I sometimes wonder if the people in the States are getting a complete and unabridged version of the news. From past experience I know that news is somewhat toned down by the time it is released for public information in the States. To one extent I appreciate this fact as I would not want my wife and children as well as my family and friends to know the full truth about the situation in this area. I believe it best that they be spared all of the worry which would be aroused by full and complete knowledge in detail of what is happening in this area. I do believe though that our lawmakers should have this knowledge made available to them. From some of the news received here in the past from the States it seems that they are either, somewhat in the dark about affairs in this part of the world, or that they simply do not care. I prefer to believe that the news is not made available to them. I

March 30

believe that all available information should be evaluated before any decisions on any matter should be made.

There is an excellent English speaking newspaper published in Saigon. I feel that this paper publishes as close to an unabridged sampling of the feelings of the Vietnamese people and the current news of southeast Asia as is obtainable. This newspaper will express a pat on the back when it is due, at the same time expressing a firm reprimand when it is deserving. This paper prints articles which attack as well as praise the policies of the United States, as well as Vietnam and many other countries. With your permission, periodically I will send you articles as well as editions of this paper along with my feelings on the matters concerned.

Enclosed you will find clippings from the February 17 edition concerning the Pershing Field blast and the Kinh-do-Capitol theater bombing. The eyewitness report of the Pershing Field blast clearly notes that the Vietnamese people knew that the bombing was to take place. The article on the Kinh-do-Capitol theater bombing was truly a dastardly act, taking out vengeance on defenseless women and children as well as the American troops (commonly referred to as advisers). The article on the Kinh-do-Capitol bombing in the February 18 edition clearly shows by the way that the Vietnamese policeman left prior to the blast that a bombing was either suspected or known to be following.

Reference February 18 edition: "Sihanouk Threatens to Seek Alliance with North Vietnamese." You will note the picture of Cambodian Chief of State Prince Norodom Sihanouk inspecting Russian MIG-17 jet fighters. The article quotes Prince Sihanouk as saying, "We will not help North Vietnam in its struggle against South Vietnam and will not favor the Vietcong but in case North Vietnam is attacked, Cambodia will war at her (North Vietnam's) side and vice versa." Another alleged incident such as happened when a Cambodian village was bombed by the Vietnamese Air Force could touch off another incident such as Korea.

On page 2 you will notice that some 12,000 persons are being treated for starvation in hospitals overflowing with patients, and emergency camps set up by the Indonesian Government. At the same time you will note on page 5 an article about the AFL-CIO dockworkers boycotting the shipment of grain to Russia. There seems to be a strange contrast between a famine in Indonesia and the sale by the U.S. Government of wheat to Russia. I had previously considered the Indonesians to be friendly to the United States. I wonder if this action won't leave a bad taste in the mouths of the peoples of other southeast Asian countries. Also on page 5 I note the Russians are borrowing a half billion dollars from Great Britain. Do you think that in the complexity of international economics that we may in the long run be paying for the wheat which we sold to the Russians?

The 76 or more American casualties in an 8-day period plus a compounding of the aforementioned incidents plus many other questionable acts of late cause grave concern in the minds of many of us serving in this area. I might well imagine this concern is shared by many others in the United States as well as abroad.

Had this been even 1 year ago I would have written to the Honorable CLARE ENGLE, of California. I have always had the utmost respect and admiration for him. I do not know the status of Mr. ENGLE as news is rather limited from the States. Just before I left the States in August he had just been operated on for a brain tumor and the press releases at that time indicated that he would never be able to fill his office again. I was indeed sorry to hear this.

I consider home to be Red Bluff, Calif.

Currently my wife and three children are living in Maxwell, Calif. I have been in the U.S. Air Force for about 12 years, and am planning to continue my service, making this my career.

I do not make a habit of writing Senators, sir. In fact I probably hate letter writing more than most people, but, I feel so strongly about these matters that I felt it my duty to write and express my opinion. I decided upon you to write as I have requested assignment in the State of Oregon upon termination of my tour of duty here in South Vietnam. I have requested duty at Kingsley Field at Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Sir, I appreciate your indulgence in these matters and sincerely hope that you do not take offense to these opinions and observations which I have stated. I personally feel much better having written you and, so to speak, getting these matters off my chest.

Yours truly,

From Oregon:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

As longtime admirer and new constituent applaud your Vietnam speech keep it up.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Support your courageous statement regarding U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam war.

Thank you.

From Maryland:

MARCH 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your stand on the Vietnam situation. This fiasco may yet develop into another Korea unless more voices like yours are heard on the subject. If we continue to send military personnel to murder Viet Cong how long will it be before the Chinese send in their military personnel to murder Vietnamese? I say murder because that is exactly what it is where there is no question of direct national defense.

Besides the millions spent in this utterly futile, negative and purposeless enterprise, we have lost 121 American lives to date. My personal opinion is that if this is typical of our foreign policy, it stinks. We should stay out of Asia entirely unless we wish to take over and be completely responsible for it or any fraction thereof. Anything short of this is a losing game and it were far better then to let the commies have the onus of these pathetic and apathetic little countries—and that includes Formosa.

Sincerely yours,

From Oregon:

MARCH 12, 1964

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be congratulated for your forthright stand in calling for the withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam.

This is to advise you that I have today written to President Johnson informing him of my support of your position, and urging him to use his office to withdraw our troops from that beleaguered area. Unfortunately, my typewriter does not make sufficiently clear carbons to permit me to send you a carbon of my letter, but I trust that this note of support will suffice.

Thank you for voicing such sorely needed sentiments. Let me know if I can support you in this in any other way.

Sincerely yours,

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A few months ago I remember you stated your opinion of the war we are carrying on in Vietnam, which was, we should get out. Since then the administration has expressed itself as being for engaging in war there on even a greater scale.

I was happy to note that Senator MIKE MANSFIELD came out against the dangerous and inhuman policy we are carrying on in Vietnam. I hope you are still of the opinion you were a few months ago and give Senator MANSFIELD support, for I fear he will need support in this war-mad era.

This is, I am sure, the most important matter in the Nation or, should I say, the world right now.

Respectfully yours,

From New Jersey:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your speech against any deeper entanglement in South Vietnam, a country where we have already wasted money and (what is far worse) sacrificed American lives for no rational purpose. It is obvious that we can no more hold it permanently than the Communists can hold Cuba.

You are also right in your criticisms of Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. Robert McNamara is the best Secretary of Defense in our history, but, as you said, even he has not the right to commit the Nation to war without consulting its representatives.

I would have written earlier, but did not know anything about your speech until reading about it in this morning's New York Times. For a long time it seemed as if everyone in Washington was resigned to our sliding helplessly into a deeper and deeper commitment to war.

It is good to know that there will be a powerful voice raised in the Senate against this inexcusable waste of lives. You deserve the gratitude of all the thousands of men whose lives may be lost in Vietnam, and of their families.

I wish there were more men with your courage in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

From Rhode Island:

MARCH 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Today in the Times I saw that you are for getting us out of fighting in Vietnam. I am sure that there are millions who agree with you. Some might not have the time or energy to write; some might hesitate to go on record against official policy. But the best hope for those suffering people is to have peace, neutrality, and a chance to vote for what they want. Trying to force water to run uphill is no part of the duty of a truly free world.

Thank you for your courage and your keen analysis. I hope you can persuade more Senators to speak up for a change in policy.

Sincerely yours,

From California:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As representative of a small community group I wish to express our appreciation to you on behalf of the many Americans who share your views and criticisms of the U.S. foreign aid program.

Without exception, the expressions and views of our group condemn this controversial waste of the taxpayers' and Government funds. We recommend immediate

withdrawal of all foreign aid and a more practicable approach toward our foreign policies.

This is not an attempt to advise how best to initiate our foreign policies; however it is quite evident among the grassroot citizens that our present policies are antiquated, inadequate and extravagant to cope with the fast changing world political situation.

We are most happy and grateful that we have elected representatives in Washington who recognize these facts and have the courage to criticize the administration's efforts to force these issues on the American public.

In the event you may wish to offer suggestions how to further our views on this subject we shall be pleased to hear from you.

Sincerely,

From Montana:

MARCH 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We want to thank you for the stand you have taken against continuing the war in South Vietnam. The United States will never win in that tortured country nor in any other country as long as we send guns, ammunition, and chemicals for destruction which is used to cause killing and suffering and division of the people.

The only way that the United States or any country can win anywhere in the world today is with understanding of the people and their problems and by giving a helping hand to bring about social and economic reforms that would benefit the people.

We have copied and continued where France left off—and are obtaining the same conclusions. We think we are an intelligent people but when we can't learn from the mistakes of others, we wonder. We could do far better if our Government would employ psychiatrists. Force and violence are becoming outdated in the atomic age.

The U.S. Government and Congress must learn to take its grievances to the United Nations instead of trying to solve problems with other nations unilaterally just because we are a powerful nation. It is not power alone which counts. The respect and love of the people of the world count far more. This is a lesson we must learn and soon.

Our hats are off to you, Senator MORSE, and to Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, ERNEST GRUENING, and others who have taken a stand on this serious and dangerous situation.

Should you be able to find time to make speeches in Montana concerning this subject we would be delighted and would want to help in any way we can. Best wishes.

Sincerely,

From New Jersey:

MARCH 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Saw and heard what you had to say on TV this morning regarding South Vietnam and I want you to know that I completely and wholeheartedly subscribe to what you said.

Very truly yours,

MARCH 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I take this opportunity to express my sincere admiration for the courageous and sensible attitude you have taken regarding the ending of our "commitment"

in South Vietnam. The sooner this absolute, senseless, bloody, and extremely expensive effort on our part is halted, the better I shall like it. I must state at this time that I had the same misgivings regarding our "police action" in Korea, but I also realize that this time we are treading on much more dangerous ground in South Vietnam than we did some 12 years ago in Korea.

I hope that this small token of interest which I am taking in your laudable effort and in the welfare of our country will be echoed many times by communications from other citizens also.

Very truly yours,

From Minnesota:

MARCH 19, 1964

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I heartily agree with your stand on the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. I can't understand why we are there, and our American boys being killed: for what?

Respectfully,

From Florida:

MARCH 20, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your statements in regard to Vietnam this morning on the Today program, and I want you to know that I support your position in this miserable adventure wholeheartedly.

We have been spending millions of our hard-earned dollars and sacrificing our young men, giving our full support to military dictatorships and corrupt regimes, and it is about time we put a stop to this. I know there must be hundreds of persons who agree with your thinking, not only on Vietnam but on other issues as well, who are too lazy to sit down and write you.

Our one big job in our country is to convince the people living under totalitarian regimes that our system provides a better life for them, and this must be done with deeds, not with words. Supporting unpopular governments with money and military force is definitely not the answer.

I consider you one of the very few intelligent Senators we have in Washington, and my hope is that you will continue to fearlessly fight for what is right.

Cordially yours,

From Michigan:

MARCH 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Accept my thanks for your courageous statement today on opposing war in Vietnam.

From Illinois:

MARCH 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This morning I saw a newscast on the Today show on TV and you gave a report on foreign aid and gave your reasons for a cut in this program.

I am a Republican—but haven't always voted so but I must admit I have yet to hear a Republican come out and give their reasons as well as you have against foreign aid. Believe me, if I were living in Oregon you would get my vote. In all of my years, I can't remember when such a program of my country has caused me such anger—especially our aid to Cambodia—I do think there are some countries where this has been used to good advantage but 9 out of 10 countries turn around and spit in our eye and I get fighting mad. Since we have to go to such extremes on this program, why not foreign aid to Russia? It makes just as much sense.

Keep up the good work Senator—I'm all for you.

Very truly yours,

From Philadelphia:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My Wife and I approve and applaud your stand on Vietnam. We agree with you that it is a mess which the United States has no business interfering with. A good policy for America would be to leave the internal affairs of other countries strictly alone.

Yours truly,

From Montana:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard excerpts on radio this morning on your address on Vietnam. You laid it on the line. I hope some of those vote hunters at any price will follow your courageous and logical analysis.

From Chicago:

MARCH 18, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your statements regarding South Vietnam.

We sure got ourselves in a mess there—12,000 miles away from home—by involving ourselves in their civil war.

Let us pull our so-called advisers out and send them home.

Yours truly,

From Ohio:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to let you know that I am in complete agreement with your policy with regard to South Vietnam.

You should be congratulated on your courageous stand advocating withdrawal of all 15,000 U.S. troops. Your opposition to any expansion of our commitments there merits nationwide support. There cannot be reached a sensible solution unless negotiations are started at once permitting the people of Vietnam, north and south, to work out their own destiny.

Respectfully yours,

From Wisconsin:

MARCH 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to register my support for your forthright stand on U.S. policy in South Vietnam and in southeast Asia in general. You pointed out that the South Vietnamese Government we support is more the U.S. State Department's government than the Government of the South Vietnamese. It really upsets me to see American boys getting killed fighting a movement that seems to have the sympathy of most of the Vietnamese.

But perhaps more disastrous is the possibility that our continued efforts at influence in southeast Asia may lead to direct confrontation with China and nuclear war. Our toying with invasion of North Vietnam shows that this is a possibility even if China acts with complete propriety.

I hope your clear thinking will have an impact on your colleagues in the Senate and will cause the State Department to reconsider its apparent all-out commitment to the defense of Kahn.

Yours truly,

6370

From Washington:

MARCH 14, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: My morning paper says you are opposed to supporting the "murder of American boys in South Vietnam and that we should get out."

I agree with you 100 percent. A lot of the world's troubles could be resolved if the United States would only mind their own business.

Yours truly,

From Georgia:

MARCH 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your remarks regarding the Vietnam situation. It seems unbelievable to me that so few people in our Government can make decisions for a free people that are not in keeping with the principles of our free and democratic society.

According to Lederer in "A Nation of Sheep" and Wm. O. Douglas in "Democracy's Manifesto" we have been guilty of behavior not befitting our character as a great nation. It seems to me our young men are not given a chance or choice to make decisions for themselves or our Nation. If we are free and if we are great, it seems to me that we should inspire and allow our youth to serve either in the armed services, the Peace Corps, the Domestic Peace Corps, as teachers in our schools, in a congressional institute, a U.N. institute, WHO, WMO, UNICEF, IDA or many other places where they are sorely needed. I feel we shall crumble morally if we do not make some drastic changes and quickly. We cannot depend on the military to dominate our policies or for only a few to formulate our policies for if we do we shall fall as a people and as a nation.

Sincerely,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We members of the Bellvue Democratic Club at our regular membership meeting unanimously applaud and support your stand against intervention and further bloodletting in South Vietnam. You have added honor to our country and security to the world.

From Massachusetts:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that on March 4, you spoke out in the Senate against U.S. participation in the war in Vietnam. Good for you. We had no business there in the first place. Our continued support of a nondemocratic government in that country on the basis of "protecting Vietnam from communism" is but simple hypocrisy. If we continue our present program the loss of American lives will increase and the suffering of the Vietnamese people will be prolonged. Your attitude on this situation seems to me to be the correct one: we should get out.

A resident of Oregon for several years, I especially appreciate the forthright position you have taken on this matter. I hope you will be able to send me a copy of your Senate speech on Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I must take time out from writing to many, many Senators about the civil rights bill, urging them to filibuster and to vote "No" on this bill; to enclose an article from the Oakland Tribune which

quotes you in regards to Vietnam. From the bottom of my heart, thank you—over and over. We are parents of two teenagers (both of whom are better typists than I), a girl 16 of years and a boy of nearly 18 years. Your comments and opinions on the mess in Vietnam are refreshing and encouraging—this is exactly what the people are saying. How long will our boys continue to act as advisers there? Will this be another Korea—with no way out? Why can we pour troops and millions of dollars into Vietnam, but we are led to believe that the cancer that Cuba is, will disappear if we shut our eyes? How can we win over communism, in Vietnam when we can't and won't do anything about it in Cuba? What is the State Department's policy—containment in Vietnam for the next 20-30 years?

Again, many, many thanks—it is a great worry to us to think that our boy and countless others, in the future and now, will be sent to Vietnam—and for what? We haven't even come up with a slogan for the war, have we? Is this to be another "police action" that another Democratic administration has plunged us into, with no end in sight? Won't we ever learn from past mistakes? Are you the only Senator who has this sensible approach on Vietnam? Surely there are others who agree, if so, why are they silent? The American people are sick and tired of "containing" communism, when they can see that the octopus is spreading. Will we "contain" it in Vietnam and ignore Cuba and South America's Red activities? I am not a warmonger, my husband lost his right leg (Marine Corps, on Guam) in World War II; but if the French couldn't stop the Red tide, what makes us think our advisers can do it? What is the solution? I agree with you—pull out. That is a start toward some solution, anyway. Thank you for listening—and thank you for your attempt to send the civil rights bill to committee. This is still a Government of the people, by the people and for the people, isn't it?

Sincerely,

From the Bronx, N. Y.:

MARCH 13, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to endorse with great enthusiasm your unequivocal call in Congress for U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam made on March 4.

As a long student in that area, having been a missionary in India, I think it was General MacArthur who warned us 10 years ago not to engage in the conflict there. His warning proved right, for he knew that the French with huge forces had to withdraw, as we will eventually have to withdraw. To sacrifice hundreds of thousands of American boys for a nebulous victory in that area is unthinkable, and would bring a vast outcry against any administration that would sanction it, as you indicated.

To save our face let the United Nations take over responsibility for a settlement along the lines of neutralization of that entire area with guarantees by the same United Nations. The U.N. saved the face of the British and French in the Suez matter and the United States in the Lebanon affair.

I trust that you will seek to win other Senators to your views on this matter. May God give you strength and wisdom and courage to carry on this fight for peace in that suffering area of God's earth.

Respectfully yours,

From Pennsylvania:

MARCH 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was pleased to see that you spoke out in opposition to escalating the war in Vietnam. There is a growing feeling in the country that we need to re-examine what we have been doing in Viet-

nam. As a sample of this sentiment, I am sending you the enclosed editorial page from the local newspaper in this Pennsylvania town where we are located for the year.

For over 10 years, we have been supporting a war in Vietnam, and there is no evidence (1) that the people of Vietnam want us there; (2) that our enormous aid is effective; and (3) that this does anything but damage our reputation in Asia and the rest of the world.

It is my hope that you will support Senator MANSFIELD and press for an honorable and peaceful solution.

Sincerely,

From Washington, D.C.:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: This letter is being written with simple directness. I wish to show my appreciation for your astute remarks made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10, on South Vietnam. I am in complete accord with everything you so aptly said on this important subject.

And at this time I also wish to show my appreciation for your being a proponent of having the civil rights bill reviewed by committee.

You are the kinds of a Senator I so greatly admire. You swim up stream when necessary. You have a great deal of courage, lots of backbone. I am sorry you ever left the Republican Party.

Sincerely,

From Wisconsin:

MARCH 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed clipping is good news, because it is high time that someone take that one down to size. Now if you and enough others who have served their country so well for so long would start working on the rest of those rats in the State Department that have a tendency of selling us down the river, we might have a chance to survive.

Thanks to you and the many others who are trying to save our wonderful country. The best of luck to you all because we are going to need it.

Sincerely yours,

From New York State:

MARCH 23, 1964.

MR. SENATOR: In 1918, when I was in the Italian Army, the Germans attacked us with poison gas many times. Now, 46 years later, I read in this article the killing of children and innocent people all over again. From the press, I learn your brilliant fight to stop this war.

Please let me congratulate you in your humanism.

[From Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Mar. 22, 1964]

WAR OF BRUTALITY—BUTCHERY OF COMMUNISTS IN VIETCONG MATCHED ONLY BY SAIGON RETRIBUTION

(By Peter Arnett and Horst Faas)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—South Vietnam's war against Communist insurgency has entered a phase of violence and brutality unmatched at any previous stage.

"The hate is building up on both sides. There are many more scores to settle now," one longtime observer noted as reports flowed by civilians of Government air attacks.

Violence has been part of Vietnamese life for 20 years. It is being compounded now

as both the Vietcong and Saigon Government build up their arms and equipment.

The Vietcong are supplementing their supplies, clandestinely brought in across the Cambodian and Laotian borders, by raids on lonely Government outposts and small convoys.

The U.S. aid commitment to Vietnam is more than replacing the weapons and ammunition lost to the Vietcong.

Included in American military aid is napalm, liquid petroleum jelly that explodes across villages in a rush of fiery death.

A newer weapon here is a phosphorous explosive fired from artillery and also from fighter bombers. This erupts in a white cloud, burning through everything it touches.

With explosives such as these, civilians are bound to be hurt. Both Americans and Vietnamese argue that they have no choice but to use them.

The spectacle of children lying half alive with napalm burns across their bodies was revolting to both Vietnamese and Americans entering a village on the Cambodian border after it had been under air attack by Government planes Thursday.

The Vietcong guerrillas retreating into this village had made it a target for Government planes. Several Vietcong were killed.

That innocent children died in this raid, and the prospect that many more may be killed as the tempo of actions continues to rise are sobering facts to the Americans here.

"The moral dilemma we face here is not what we faced in Korea and every other war we fought in," one American officer said. "We don't want to see the civilians killed and yet they are killed because that is a horrible byproduct of war."

Such a byproduct came after 300 Vietcong entered the village complex of Ben Cau in Tay Ninh Province several weeks ago and held the population hostage. The military decided to direct artillery fire on the village, virtually razing it and taking scores of civilian casualties.

But the Vietcong force was decimated and this was the object of attack.

In Government operations the civilian casualties are byproducts, but the Communist guerrillas terrorize civilians as a * * * of fighting war. They will burn a village to the ground rather than let people side with the Government, as they did in Cao Dai Province village of Phu My—the birthplace of the Vietnamese chief of state, Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh.

In the delta Province of Kien Hoa, the Vietcong in December beheaded scores of farmers who refused to pay a heavy special tax on Vietcong-controlled areas to pay for the increasing cost of war.

Five days ago in Nui Binh outpost 20 miles south of Saigon women and children were bayoneted to death by the Vietcong after a part of the post had been overrun.

Similar instances are legion in Mekong Delta. Early in January American advisers were taken to southern Ca Mau Peninsula to see the bodies of a score of women who had been disemboweled by the Vietcong and placed in front of an outpost which had been overrun.

Communist terrorism appears aimed at terrorizing the population into obedience. Or it can be aimed spitefully, as bombing of the American movie theater and softball stadium in Saigon indicates. Many of the casualties in these two bombings were women and children.

The Vietcong are believed to have perfected a primitive napalm of their own, launched from a rifle-like weapon. Some government troops have suffered serious burns from "balls of fire" flying at them from Vietcong positions.

Harshness of the present stage of war is

seen in treatment meted out to prisoners. Paramilitary corpsmen taken prisoner by the Vietcong a few weeks ago were found slaughtered a few days later.

In several cases wounded Americans taken prisoner have been executed. On the other hand American advisers report that in some cases it is difficult to restrain the Government troops from killing or torturing their prisoners in retribution.

From Kansas:

MARCH 22, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I commend and encourage you in your valiant battle against our Government's mad venture in South Vietnam. There are few instances in history where a big bully nation tried to impose on a small nation, a government the people do not want and are determined not to have as the United States is trying to do in this impoverished country.

I feel sure that a goodly percent of the people of this country are opposed to what we are doing in South Vietnam but in this day of demanded conformity to the warped news media version of patriotism, of character assassination by "witch hunting" congressional committees, of employer blacklists, etc., most people are afraid to speak out.

To me it is unthinkable that American boys are dying in this abominable situation.

I beg to remain very truly yours in the hope that sanity will prevail.

From New York:

MARCH 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was gratified to read of your forthright remarks re our policy in Vietnam. We do not have any right to be there, nor do we have any moral right to impose a puppet government on an unwilling people.

With all our efforts it is doubtful that we will have any more success than the French before us.

We should get out of Vietnam.

Sincerely,

From Illinois:

MARCH 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I strongly support your stand calling for withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam. I do not believe the United States should support a government which is obviously not wanted by the majority of the people of Vietnam. It is unfair to expect mothers and wives to send their sons and husbands to fight or act as "observers" in such a situation.

North and South Vietnam should be neutralized and demilitarized so that the people there can finally live in peace.

Very truly yours,

From Massachusetts:

MARCH 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know how completely I agree with your views on our policy in South Vietnam, as reported yesterday in the New York Times, and in fact I almost always agree with your views, especially on international relations.

The sooner we get out of there the better. People say that then all southeast Asia will go Communist. Suppose it does. The Communists are fighting among themselves, and in any case I cannot believe that such a result would have any serious effect on the United States.

Sincerely yours,

From New York:

MARCH 20, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have long been waiting to hear the leaders of our country to have the sense, the patriotism, and the guts to say in public what I heard you say this morning on the "Today" TV show; namely, that we should get out of Vietnam now instead of allowing our increased participation which would thus increase the number of U.S. deaths (and possibly triggering a nuclear war).

Please excuse this sloppy looking letter, as I am getting ready to go to work—I just wanted to tell you I support your attitude in this Vietnam war. I will write tonight to President Johnson and my own Senators and Representatives and tell them what I tell you.

Thank you—I wish you were my Senator, we could use a lot more like you.

Sincerely,

TODAY IN WASHINGTON: MORSE WILL FIGHT
"MURDER OF AMERICANS" IN VIETNAM

WASHINGTON.—In the news from Washington:

MORSE—Vietnam: Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, blasting U.S. policy in South Vietnam for the third time in as many days, says he will not "support the murder of American boys" in the embattled south-east Asian country.

"We should get out," MORSE said in a Senate speech Friday. He received permission to interrupt debate on the civil rights bill for his speech.

From Ohio:

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: Let's keep this planet from becoming a bare ball rolling in space.

Please use all your might, main, and speech on the floor to stop the dirty war in Vietnam, why kill our young men in fact to no purpose—and can lead into the final war on this planet. After any world war now, this planet would be just about worthless to anyone. It seems warmongering is a form of insanity. Please stop it if you possibly can. I am a veteran of World War I. Let's save America. Do all you possibly can and I would like to help you.

All power to you.

From Michigan:

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I cannot resist thanking you from the depths of my heart for your courageous stand about South Vietnam. May God bless you and may your stand make other Senators and Representatives at last see the light.

Most sincerely,

From Ohio:

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I support wholeheartedly your efforts toward the removal of U.S. troops from action in Vietnam.

From Pennsylvania:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your call for a withdrawal of our forces in Vietnam. As a mother very much pre-occupied right now with the dangers to world peace of the Vietnam war, I am so happy to hear someone finally challenging the posi-

March 30

tion we have taken there and bringing the question of "whether or not," and not just "how" into the matter.

If we emphasize the humanitarian aspects of our withdrawal—ending the bloodshed, etc.—I believe we can save our prestige and retain our influence and pressure for democratic institutions by no-strings economic help, not military.

Sincerely,

From New York State:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is in support of the effort to get our troops and murderous equipment out of Vietnam and to establish a neutral zone there in line with President de Gaulle's suggestions.

Every effort to liberate nations to their own fuller resources of matter and spirit. Not one dime or ounce of energy invested in murder as a means of liberation.

Defeating communism is a mere mania. But advancing a meaningful society in which human beings exercise dignity and democracy and adequate means of subsistence—now there is a task worthy of nations and individuals.

Are we too weak for that?

Sincerely,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a line to congratulate you on your stand against further involvement in Vietnam.

This is like a light shining in a wilderness of violence and hate.

Sincerely,

From Pennsylvania:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo for your Senate remarks of March 20, on Vietnam and on Secretary Rusk above all. For too long the truth about Vietnam has been kept hidden from the Nation. What is even worse, it seems to me, is that the 1954 origins of the present U.S. involvement are virtually unknown and/or buried. In fact, there is indication that Secretary Rusk himself does not even know that it was U.S. refusal to accept the accords of 1954 (Geneva) and to hold the promised elections that started the warfare—warfare that hardly began only in 1960-61.

Please keep up the good work.

From New York State:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the stand you have taken on South Vietnam. This is to let you know that we wholeheartedly support your view that our country should not be militarily involved in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We strongly favor a program designed to terminate our military involvement and to negotiate a political settlement in southeast Asia. How this can be done without involving and recognizing China is beyond us, and we favor efforts to establish negotiations with China on these matters.

With many thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations for your courageous statements concerning Vietnam. It is high time men in government make it plain to our foreign department and our President that many people are changing their views about our cause. To me, "our

fighting for their freedom" is a wornout phrase which no longer has much meaning. These southeastern Asians need a government that can provide a leadership to allow them to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. I think there is no better example of this process in the world today than that of Red China. Outward results of China's progress and the reading of Mr. Edgar Snow's documentary book on Red China plus his prophetic book, "Red Sea Over China," has no doubt changed my opinions a great deal in the past few months.

It is not hard to reason that our way of life is not a model form for ignorant and backward nations.

In spite of national pride, I doubt that we can or will do as much for the billions of miserable creatures on this earth as can the Communist regimes. This is quite an about-face idea for one who claims rugged individualism.

Senator MORSE, I was a naval aviator for 9 years, prior to and during World War II period. I had some duty aboard ship at Guantanamo Bay, and I had an eye view of real poverty in the villages just off base limits. I shall never forget my shock of such conditions 90 miles from our shores. We deserve Castro, and it seems as though the rest of the world agrees.

I hope to God, Senator, that there are enough men like you in government that will eventually change our Nation into a shining example of good will toward all men instead of the laughing stock it appears to be.

Sincerely,

The following from Massachusetts:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For a long time I have admired and appreciated your courage and ability as a Senator especially when you speak out on the controversial issues which, though most important to us, are oftentimes alas, least debated because they are so controversial.

Your position now as concerns the Vietnamese situation seems to me especially admirable. Knowing as you do, that what you say is not popular, either with the establishment or the populace, yet you speak out with truth and clarity.

On such men as you, sir, our democracy depends, hangs by a slender thread.

On this Vietnamese business—the futility of it—the contradictions of it—I've tried to get through to other Senators and the President and the result as you know as the "form letter brush off" which on the face of it achieves nothing.

Time grows short for this country, I am afraid, on the basis of the policies it has for some time been pursuing.

The obsessive pursuit of the White Whale with Ahab in command—America 1964.

Most respectfully,

From Massachusetts:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I'm far removed geographically from your voting district, I write this letter in praise of your March 4 Senate speech against further U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

I wish that others of your constituents had the courage and wisdom to stand up and talk on this subject that will involve us all if allowed to go unchecked.

Please try to get your message through as the northeast papers in general did not give it too good coverage.

God bless you for your courage. As an American citizen I hope we're not just pawns in a gigantic game of power politics but could be given the truth about Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Yours truly,

From California:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily approve your March 4 call for U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam, and have said so in my letters to President Johnson and Senators ENGLE and KUCHEL. I hope fervently that you will raise your voice in this cause again and again; I can think of no way in which you could better serve your country in these too-disturbing days.

Your honesty and courage in this matter give me hope. More power to you.

Gratefully,

From Washington State:

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you wholeheartedly, the situation in Vietnam is sickening beyond description. Both politically and strategically we are in a dilemma and the only way out would be to admit it and pull our troops out. In light of what you have said and information I have from I. F. Stone's Weekly, I felt compelled to wire to President Johnson.

You may be interested to know that the local American Friends Service Committee is holding an Easter Peace Witness, March 28, and the theme is Vietnam. Other groups such as Women's International for Peace and Freedom, Women for Peace (Seattle) also carry on an educational and protest campaign.

We hope to reach our two Senators with this message, but so far have been quite unsuccessful.

Respectfully yours,

From Maine:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is just to let you know that others besides your Oregonian constituents are applauding your stand on Vietnam and Asia generally. I only wish we in Maine had as good representation in Washington. In Red Book magazine last October an article by one Norman Lofsen spoke up for women whose husbands have died in this "war not a war" and I think that the people, more and more, are condemning our actions over in Asia. Thank you for your frank and courageous stand.

Sincerely yours,

From New York State:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, thank you for your forthright stand against the extension of the war in Vietnam, and for calling for the return of our troops.

I have just written to the President and the New York State senators urging that they work for these objectives.

It is terrifying to think of the possible consequences of carrying the war to the North. Apart from the many thousands of casualties that would result, both ours and Vietnamese, it could easily lead to a nuclear holocaust.

I congratulate you on your stand and know that you will keep on working for peace and peaceful solutions to all world problems.

Respectfully,

MORSE OBJECTS

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, blasting U.S. policy in South Vietnam for the third time in as many days, says he will not "support the murder of American boys" in the embattled southeast Asian country.

"We should get out," MORSE said in a Senate speech Friday. He received permission to interrupt debate on the civil rights bill for his speech.

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very happy to read of your speech in the Senate Friday, advocating that the United States get out of South Vietnam. I hope you have enough supporters, as well as in the House, to make an impression on the State Department and the administration to see the folly of this Nation's continuing to dissipate its material and financial resources in such a vain effort to contain communism in that area. More power to you and your colleagues.

Here is how I feel, Senator MORSE:

1. That in spite of the free world's efforts (largely the United States) that the Communists will eventually take over all of south-east Asia anyway, and that includes all of former Indochina. And in such a takeover, all the millions of installations and institutions we have laid there will fall to the Communists. Billions down the rathole.

2. The State Department holds its hand up in horror apparently at the thought of more Communist penetration in Indochina. So what? This does not endanger the territorial United States in any way that I can see. And if it is argued that such penetration would endanger the Philippines and Japan, I believe that the presence of our mighty 7th Fleet and its accompanying Air Force squadrons, as well as the land-based air forces in Japan would be sufficient deterrent to hold off the Chinese Nationalists. And surely our Polaris subs could deliver a mighty barrage of missiles. I do not believe that land forces are the answer, certainly not in those steaming, stinking jungles.

3. I hold that this Nation might better devote some of the billions now being wasted in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to a further buildup of our military, air, and naval forces in this hemisphere; make this Nation impregnable from attack. Frankly, Senator MORSE, I am just a bit more afraid of general deterioration and crumbling within this Nation as a result of nefarious, underground, tricky work (unsuspected by most people), than I am from an all-out attack from without our borders. Witness the wave of terrorism seeping the country; the dynamiting of the freight trains on the Florida East Coast Railroad; the many derailments of freight trains on the Erie-Lackawanna and New York Central Railroads in New York State during the last 4 months; the unrest and violence of the civil rights demonstrations, which I believe have been largely Communist agitated; and right in our own Finger Lakes section of central New York State there has been a wave of dairy barn fires by arsonists, which could be the result of Communist youth underground activities trying to undermine and weaken our economy by destroying our agricultural potential. You will recall that the New York State College of Agriculture is located at Cornell University in Ithaca; this area has many of the State's richest dairy farms. The area's best detective and police forces are hard at work on trying to solve this wave of incendiary fires; farmers are patrolling the roads at night.

4. And finally, Senator MORSE, it seems that the obstinate and stubborn State Department seems to forget that in pouring out billions to southeast Asia for economic and military aid (and so-called foreign aid) as well, that they are but weakening the ability and potential of this Nation to exist and to carry on as a nation to uphold the cause of freedom in our own country; to insure the continuance of our American way of life;

to maintain financial integrity and the value of the dollar. Economists are forecasting that inflation is a near possibility; even the United States could bleed itself poor, as we are rapidly becoming, it seems, if useless expenditures are not checked.

Best of luck to you, Senator MORSE, in your worthy efforts to make the administration and the State Department to see the light of reason and sanity in foreign affairs. I hope I have not bored you with all this. If it, perhaps, has given you any ammunition in your battle, I will be happy; also, to hear from you, if you have the opportunity.

Thanking you, I am, sir.

Sincerely,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am a physician, a captain in the U.S. Army Reserve, presently on active duty in Korea. I am moved to write to you in reference to your statement on Vietnam, made in the Senate on Tuesday, March 10, 1964. I want to communicate to you my sense of grateful relief that there is someone in Washington who has both the insight and the integrity necessary to say what you did. Thank you.

I wish to propose that the members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, and every one of the people from whose consent the Government derives its just power, consider our foreign policy, when lives are at stake, not in terms of our prestige, or our fortunes, but in terms of the necessity to preserve for ourselves and our posterity these three inalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Very respectfully yours,

From Colorado:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just finished reading a quote of yours to the effect that, "millions of Americans are beginning to realize that it is time for us to get out of South Vietnam." Would you please tell me whether you agree with this line of thinking and why.

In case your answer is yes, and you do go along with this line of thinking, I would like to know if you think that the end of the road for South Vietnam is the end of the Communist road of conquest? If you think this is so, then do you think that Communist aggression in South America, Latin America, Africa, and the Near and Far East are diversions for the overthrow of this single country.

Being as humble as is required of a mere ignorant high school student, I would like to point out that in a good many, too many of the great contests in history, that we have let down our allies in an attempt to remain neutral, or for whatever reasons. This is no longer possible. A wrong step in this contest for global domination, a wrong move, can be the move that destroys us.

Surely, Vietnam is not this move, but the fall of Vietnam would certainly weaken the United States and strengthen the Communists for their next move.

Withdrawal from Vietnam would surely echo down the halls of history as loudly as if we had withdrawn from Italy in 1943. They would both be stupid mistakes.

And so, in closing sir, I would like to most eagerly suggest that you reexamine the facts involved, and keep in mind that it is easier crushing the ants and termites across the street than on your doorstep or in your own house.

With regards and suggestions for contemplation,

From California:

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Although I have not written to you for a long time I am still an ardent supporter of yours, for the issues you stand for are always for the general welfare instead of for a privileged few.

This time let me say a hearty thank you and thank God for your recent protest of our dirty war in Vietnam. It was, I believe, the former administration that got us into this stupid mess, and I feel the Democrats ought to be smart enough to get us out.

Also let me ask you to support the reparation bill to the Seneca Indians of Pennsylvania. Our past record of dealings with the Indians is shameful.

Sincerely and respectfully,

From Wisconsin:

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to thank you for the prompt and courteous attention that our request for material on foreign aid received.

Our team proposed that all economic foreign aid be discontinued. We turned out to be the victors in the debate and we are sure that the success of the debate is due largely to the help you gave us in the material that you sent to us.

Thank you very much for your kind service.

From California:

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was more than delighted to read in the Allen-Scott column of your stand regarding Vietnam. I consider that every American life lost in such projects is murder, as you so aptly expressed it. Although I am not one of your constituents I have long admired your commonsense, determination, and courage in expressing your convictions. In the present case I am sure that you would have an overwhelming following of Americans if you would continue to oppose our present policy in Vietnam and other obscure areas of the world, in many of which we have no business being in the first place, and where we are much resented for all our efforts.

I enclose the copy of a letter to President Johnson sent over a month ago, to which I have not yet received a reply. I am pursuing the matter further with the help of several influential Santa Barbara friends. I am particularly interested in knowing how you feel regarding the use of draftees in areas like Vietnam and whether it is possible to initiate legislation prohibiting their use except on a volunteer basis which would be more like our pre-World War II professional army.

Respectfully submitted,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Though our present foreign policy, stemming from previous administrations, particularly that of Eisen-

6374

hower (and Dulles) has committed us to odd and obscure corners of the world, it must be evident to our leaders that such policy may be very unpopular with many people in the country. I happen to be among them.

I directed a note to Mr. Sorenson, as adviser to President Kennedy, expressing this viewpoint and specifically asking about our policy as far as selecting men to serve in our Armed Forces in these areas. He acknowledged the letter but did not answer the question. Since I have a boy who will serve his country within a few years, I am vitally interested. It is my sincere conviction that our young men should not be required to serve and have their lives jeopardized in questionable and unpopular causes espoused by our State Department. This is not the same thing at all in my opinion as serving in wartime in the defense of our country. Specifically I believe that men sent to places like Laos, Vietnam, and heaven knows what other such a place in Asia and Africa should be either selected from Regular Army or should be on a volunteer basis with the approval of the parents. I cannot but imagine the bitterness of parents whose son may be inducted into the service only to lose his life in one of these obscure corners of the Far East. It is hard to argue that this is in defense of his country. I hope to learn in answer to this letter what our policy is and hope to find that men are selected to serve on the basis mentioned above or one similar to it. If not, I am going to try and start something by appealing to Members of the Congress to effect a change.

Respectfully submitted,

From Washington, D.C.:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The gratitude of the people of America goes out to you for your valiant effort to reduce the cost of foreign aid. We wish you success in your fight to reduce the present AID request for three billion, four hundred million dollars. Fight on.

Good luck.

Yours sincerely,

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are greatly disturbed by the statement of March 17 in which the White House declared its intention to continue and increase U.S. military aid to South Vietnam.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD on February 19 spoke out against such a policy and urged serious consideration of the case for the neutralization of Vietnam.

On March 4, you registered your opposition to our increasing the scale of U.S. participation in the Vietnamese war and urged our withdrawal from it. We want to congratulate you for taking this firm and courageous position in the Senate.

Mr. Senator, our leaders have involved us in a costly, futile, and dangerous war; a war the consent for which has not been asked of the American people or of the U.S. Senate. The American people do not have their hearts on this war anymore than the South Vietnamese people do. We cannot win this war unless we increase our participation in it to the point where we will have another Korea (or worse) on our hands. We don't want another Korea. We must negotiate. Sir, we must bring our troops home now.

We urge you again to do everything within your power as U.S. Senator to encourage and bring about a U.S. policy in Vietnam which will permit negotiation and our prompt and complete withdrawal from that war.

Very truly yours,

From California:

MARCH 17, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I have this day written to the President, to Senator KUCHEL, and to Congressman ALPHONZO BELL—telling them that I agree with you 100 percent in your recent statement that we should get the United States out of South Vietnam. I told them that 98 percent of the people there were against the United States and against the Saigon government. I said I didn't want this McNamara getting the United States involved in a world atomic war by invading North Vietnam—and bringing China and U.S.S.R. into the mess—which would surely happen if we invaded in any manner.

I hope you will continue your efforts to get the United States out of this South Vietnam mess—before we are dragged into a bigger mess.

I also urge you, sir, to help the southern bloc defeat the civil rights bill. You probably won't, but if you could see what the Negroes are doing down here in California you would realize—that Negroes and white people just won't ever mix—read Lincoln's real opinion of Negroes.

Best wishes for now.

From California:

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: I, too, am yelling evacuate Vietnam. I advocate and support your stand. The sooner we pull out of southeast Asia, the better off we will be.

"EVACUATE VIETNAM," MORSE YELLS

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate on Friday he will not "support the murder of American boys in South Vietnam."

MORSE said it was "presumptuous" for Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to try to say what this Government should do there.

"We should get out," MORSE shouted, adding that fighting between the Communist and anti-Communist factions in South Vietnam would end in a neutralization "if we were not egging them on."

MORSE obtained permission to interrupt debate on the civil rights bill to deliver his third speech in as many days against U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam.

From California:

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: From my heart, I thank you for your stand against our intervention in Vietnam.

There has been enough bloodshed—continuing may lead to a world war. Bring our boys home.

Yours gratefully,

From California:

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: I commend you for speaking out so courageously to the State Department of getting out of Vietnam.

I have been following this situation since 1961 and have written to our late President Kennedy, Mr. Rusk, my Senators, Representatives, etc., but only received printed material. Once in a while I'd get a personal reply that we must keep South Vietnam free from communism.

I have just written to President Johnson, Harriman, Senator KUCHEL, Representative ROYAL. I am also commending Senator GRUENING, of Alaska. I commended Senator MANSFIELD a few weeks ago.

Why can't we get more Senators and Congressmen to speak up? After all, they do represent the people.

We need more men like you. Best wishes.
Sincerely yours,

From New York:

BRONX, N.Y., MARCH 2, 1964.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The all too brief press reports of your efforts to end the senseless waste of lives and money in South Vietnam, should earn the gratitude of all Americans. I hope you will continue your efforts to bring this undeclared war to an end and allow the people of Vietnam to form a neutral government.

I would like a copy of your speech if it is available.

Thank you,

From Connecticut:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you to congratulate you on your statement that we should pull U.S. troops out of South Vietnam. It takes courage to take such a strong position against the militarist and the brainwashed American public.

Using commonsense I cannot figure out why we have a 15,000 Army in Vietnam. Why should we interfere into the affairs of other nations? The world would think better of us if we would quit trying to force our so-called democracy down the throats of other nations and start at home and give democracy to our own Negroes, Indians, and other minority groups. Even here in Connecticut the reactionaries are fighting the Supreme Court reapportionment order giving one man one vote.

I might add Senator that I admire your stand on what you think is right regardless of so-called popular opinion. Popular opinion seems to be what the big newspapers, radio, TV, and big industrialists want it to be. I do not say I agree with you on everything but your views fit mine better than any other big public man. Only wish it was you that I could vote for for President which I fully understand that cannot be with the political setup as it is.

Respectfully,

P.S.—Copy to Congressman WILLIAM L. STONGE, of Connecticut.

From Florida:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Heartily approve your stand regarding foreign aid bill.

Respectfully,

From New York:

Brooklyn, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Congratulations and thanks for your stand on ending the war in Vietnam. This is such a dangerous situation that we must see an end of the killing as well the danger of escalation.

I hope you can get a group of national representatives and nationally important people to join with you to raise such a protest that something must be done to get us out of other countries—especially Vietnam.

Sincerely,

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my admiration and my gratitude to you for your realistic and honest attitude toward the frightening, undeclared war now going on in Vietnam. I hope that you will be able to arouse our lawmakers to the sinister threat

1964

6375

posed by our efforts to step up the bloodshed further involve our forces. Can we learn nothing from past disasters? Let us turn to the use of negotiations, cease to consider ourselves the sole arbiters, and recognize that military force cannot solve the problems any more than it did for Indochina.

More power to you. Thousands now look to you for leadership, with hope.
Sincerely yours,

From New York:

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am so glad you are leading in a movement to stop the fighting in Vietnam. It has seemed to me for some time now both immoral and impractical for the United States to be shoring up governments over there that are of at least doubtful value. It seems to me we cannot spread democracy with arms, as war promotes communism. Moreover, it is not our duty any more than it was Britain's—up until recently—to police the whole earth, to the end that only governments friendly to the United States shall prosper. This is no way to "win friends and influence people."

So we wish you much strength and express our wholehearted support of your strength to get our military people out of North Vietnam. It would be good to get them out of a lot of other places, too, like Spain and Portugal, but we can't hope for everything at once.

Sincerely,

From New York:

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We are in full agreement with your stand on the situation in Vietnam. We hope our President will act in accordance with this.
Sincerely yours,

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just written to Senator GRUENING, and I wish to inform you as well, that I fully support your statements calling for the withdrawal of all American troops from the South Vietnam war.

That war was never ours to win. We never should have gotten ourselves involved in attempting to crush a movement which is basically a social revolution and possesses a *raison d'être* independent of the will of various U.S. administrations, including the most recent.

All of the above is really beside the point. We should get out and not waste more time, men, or moneys in defense of the indefensible. This takes courage to say and resay at this time, particularly in view of the opposition of the administration and most conditions of public opinion.

Please do not lose heart. The McNamaras and the Rusks and similar "Yes" men, pollute the histories of all nations with their doings. They need no emulation.

I give you all my support and wish I could be in the future more helpful in raising the utmost concern over this issue.

Sincerely yours,

From Pennsylvania:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The situation in Vietnam seems to me quite intolerable. I commend you for your efforts to try to change our policy.

Sincerely yours,

From New York:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On the issue of Vietnam and the extension of the war into North Vietnam, as proposed by some circles—I'd like to congratulate you on your position. It's good to know (as is so often character-

istic of our country) that there are representatives like you who have the guts and moral fortitude to cry out against insanity and possibly world war III.

My wife and children bless you.

Sincerely,

From Connecticut:

MARCH 22, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am taking the liberty to express my congratulations for the courageous speech that your honor made before the Senate. And at the same time I stretch my hand to your honorable colleague, ERNEST GRUENING. You are two heroes, and you have defended the interest of our great Nation. The people that libel your honest and patriotic criticism of communism are people who carry this country to a wrong destiny. We have enough in our own house to attend to. It is not right to stretch our nose further away.

For what we have spent in foreign lands we could help our railroads which are of a vital interest to the Nation. We could fight the deficit in our house. For defense? We have two great fortresses—two great seas. Then we have more nerve than all the Old World put together. We try the best way to be in good relation with all nations of the world.

Very truly yours,

From California:

MARCH 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please find inclosed copy of a letter which I have sent to President Johnson. I hope you will find the letter of interest.

I wish to commend you for your leadership in telling the State Department to withdraw the U.S. troops from South Vietnam and to seek a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam crisis.

I would like to ask that you will support Senator MANSFIELD in his attempt to find a sensible solution to the problems we face in Vietnam—to approve the French President de Gaulle's proposals for neutralization of all Vietnam.

Sincerely and gratefully yours,

MARCH 8, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: As a Vietnamese-American I am very much concerned about the war now waging in the land of my birth. Being familiar with the situation in that unhappy country, I would like to bring the following facts to your attention.

1. The so-called guerrillas are not invaders from the north but simple South Vietnamese people who feel they are only continuing the many years of struggle for independence and freedom from foreign domination.

2. Since France with armies numbering almost a half million was unable to overcome the stubborn resistance of the much smaller Vietnamese people's forces of liberation there seems no better chance of our winning the present struggle. Rather a disaster similar to that suffered by France at Dienbienphu seems much more likely.

3. The people of South Vietnam, exhausted from more than 20 years of unceasing struggle do not have any reason for continuing the war. They want only to be left alone to organize their own government and restore their shattered economy.

4. The present Saigon government is no more popular with the people than was the

cruel dictatorship of Diem and his family. Innocent people are still being tortured and young men forced into military service. American personnel in the country as "advisers" are unsafe as they are regarded as foreign oppressors backing up the hated ruling groups.

5. The South Vietnamese people do not consider their brothers in the north as enemies to be fought, but favor reunification with them under conditions set forth in the 1954 Geneva agreement for neutralization of both parts of the country.

6. President de Gaulle's proposals for neutralization of what was formerly French Indochina under the supervision of the powers which ratified the 1954 Geneva Agreement have been met with hope and enthusiasm. Ho-Chi-Minh, President of North Vietnam, has also expressed interest in this plan. Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's speech calling on the Senate to study the French President's proposals has given great encouragement to all those vitally concerned with the peaceful solution of the differences in Vietnam.

7. The Vietnamese people do not share the fear frequently expressed in this country that China will attack if the U.S. Army advisers and officers are withdrawn. The history of Vietnam reveals that many invaders have attacked the country throughout the centuries. But so determined has been the will to resist any foreign domination that the intruder has always been turned back. The Chinese who have had experience with this stubborn Vietnamese resistance, are certainly aware of this fact.

8. The proposal of some Americans to carry the war to North Vietnam would prove, in my opinion, an extremely dangerous venture. Such action might very well lead to World War III. The problems existing in South Vietnam can never be settled through military action.

I ask you, Mr. President, to use your influence to bring about a peaceful settlement through neutralization of all Vietnam. You will be acting in the best interests not only of the Vietnamese and American people but of all mankind.

Respectfully yours,

MARCH 22, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you on your plea to withdraw our forces in the undeclared war in Vietnam. We are supporting men in power there who do not have the support of the people. If we extend the war to the North, it would equally add to the elements to defeat. And then our prestige would fall with our allies and would add to the escalating of a third war.

Let us withdraw and negotiate a peace through the United Nations.

I wish to express my appreciation of your stand as well as that of Senators MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY.

Sincerely yours,

From the State of Washington:

MARCH 20, 1964.

DEAR CROTCHETY OLD WAYNE MORSE: I salute you on the only paper in the house. I salute you with a title connoting—in these times—honor beyond and way above the correct one.

Yippee for you, sir. You have made the only sensible statement on the U.S. future in the southeast Asia area. I heard your remarks quoted on radio KIRO news-cast yesterday. Keep talking. Keep reminding people of history's lessons to the French and British. It makes plain good sense, doesn't it? And costs somewhat less

March 30

to get out than to continue or expand our present efforts.

I'm a wild-eyed liberal, so you can see conservatives have no corner on horsesense. Talk more.

Kudos,

From Florida:

"A critic of the U.S. foreign aid program and an advocate of the withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Viet Nam, Morse called Rusk's speech 'disgraceful and disruptable' and 'one of the most unfortunate by a responsible government official in many years.'" Yes.
Re Vietnam.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your opinion on Vietnam I am 100 percent for you.

MARCH 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your courage in calling for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. Our sons should never have been there shedding their blood for a cause which is not ours.

American fathers and mothers will be grateful to you forever for trying to save the lives of their strong young sons. Yours is a lonely voice now, but it will be joined by the voices of millions of peace-loving Americans.

Keep up your magnificent efforts for peace, freedom and abundance for all the people of the earth.

Gratefully yours,

From New York:

MARCH 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Honor and glory to you for your courageous stand regarding South Vietnam.

There is still hope for mankind when people like you are in the Senate.

The voice of Senator Dodd and his ilk is the voice of evil. What they stand for can lead only to nuclear war and man's destruction.

Keep up your good work. Decent men in the United States of America and the rest of the world are with you.

Respectfully,

From New York State:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with heartfelt support that I hasten to urge your continued fight for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.

Our policy is a failure and can only ignite a world conflagration. We must not permit this to happen.

Yours must be a lonely battle but be assured that while few citizens write, many are strong in support of your efforts.

I am also writing to the President urging him to consider a reversal of our policy thereby proving to the world that we are willing to negotiate.

This is indeed an age of deep apprehension. But we must learn to survive it.

Respectfully yours,

From Pennsylvania:

MARCH 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A second letter of appreciation for the speech made by you regarding Rusk and his McCarthyite type of accusation.

It may interest you to know that while heretofore I have had to rely on publications such as I. F. Stone's Weekly to learn of op-

position to our genocidal policy in Vietnam, your most recent speech was published in our Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and so I believe that for the first time thousands of Philadelphians will become aware that there is congressional opposition to administration activity in Vietnam.

In behalf of peace-loving Americans, thank you.

I have written to CLARK asking him to support you.

I hope you will support CLARK in his contention that it is unconstitutional for Congressmen to retain their commissions in the Reserve Forces. As a member of the American Civil Liberties Union I have today written to them, asking them if there is not some way of testing the constitutionality of the 1930 statute.

Please note that Cambodia has appealed to the United Nations against United States-South Vietnam violations of her border, in which her people are being killed. I have written to U Thant asking him to call for a conference, and I have also thanked De Gaulle for his proposals. Thank heavens I can call on four or five American Congressmen to put an end to our shameful actions in Asia.

Sincerely,

From Massachusetts:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just wanted to send you a fan letter saying how pleased I am with the courageous position you have taken on the issue of American intervention in South Vietnam. The world is not a huge piece of American real estate and the sooner our Government realizes that, the better off it will be. Don't back down to the Dean Rusk and your role as one of the few free-thinking American politicians will be secure.

Yours,

From New York State:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my admiration and appreciation of your forthright and eloquent criticism of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his smear tactics (Saturday New York Times) against you and others that oppose his policy in South Vietnam.

We need more such voices as yours and Mr. Gruening's (and others) not afraid to be dissidents when so much in our country and the world's affairs are at stake.

Yours truly,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please be informed that I have written to President Johnson condemning Secretary of State Rusk's remarks about you and Senator Gruening in which he indicated that you and Senator Gruening were guilty of unpatriotic statements concerning South Vietnam.

May I commend you for your position relating to the United States involvement in South Vietnam. I believe with you that we are guilty of more than folly. We will be charged by history (if we are sensible enough to avoid a nuclear holocaust) of being responsible for the death of tens of thousands of Vietnamese as well as many U.S. servicemen.

Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In regard to your recent taking Mr. Dean Rusk to task (see the enclosed news clipping from the Schenectady Gazette): good, good. And a bigger cheer for your speech (in regard to South Vietnam) of March 4 in the Senate. It's my guess that you've got a hell of a lot of support around the country for your position on South Vietnam. Keep hammering away, Senator—don't back down an inch.

Ours is an immoral, provocative, extremely danger laden position in Vietnam—and we need voices of courage in high places to appraise the American public of this fact.

Again, Senator, bravo (and the same to Senators GRUENING, BARTLETT, MANSFIELD, and ELLENDER—may your tribe increase). As an American, I am ashamed that the two dirtiest words in Asia, today, are Hiroshima and napalm.

Sincerely,

From Pennsylvania:

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in complete agreement with you concerning wisdom of withdrawal from Vietnam of hundreds with whom Vietnam was discussed. Everyone spoke in most disappointing terms over our 10-year involvement. A nonmilitary solution should be sought. Am sending copies to my Senators and Representative as well as President Johnson.

From Michigan:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR MR. MORSE: It is very gratifying to hear the best brains west of the Mississippi speak out about the fracas in Vietnam.

My sincere thanks to you.

Very sincerely,

P.S.—I watch the "Today" show almost daily.

From New York State:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not one of your constituents, but I wish I were. It would be nice to have a real live Senator representing me. But as a responsible Senator, you do represent all of us. I approve heartily of your stand on Vietnam, and am with you 100 percent, when you state, "Let's get out of Vietnam." The latest incident on the Cambodian border has left me physically sick. What has happened to our ideals and standards if we can bomb, strafe, and spray with napalm gasoline (which we used to deny using), innocent villagers who don't even know what it's all about? And American planes were used on both sides. Let's get out before more such ugly incidents occur, and they must, as this dirty war drags on.

Respectfully yours,

From Maryland:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I, as well as most of my friends, completely support your sensible, realistic stand on withdrawing our military forces from South Vietnam.

We would like to form a delegation to call upon the Senators of our State to urge them to support your intelligent position. Do you have any material that you could send me that would assist us in our purpose?

We are interested in doing anything that will help achieve success in your courageous efforts so please advise me of any other ways that we can be helpful.

Very sincerely,

From Illinois:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Last night after reading an article in the Chicago American titled, "Two Dems Attack Rusk Talk as 'McCarthyism,'" byline, one Ernest B. Vaccaro, and reading remarks

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6377

ascribed to you therein it was my unpleasant necessity to get outside and retch.

Within my memory this is the second occasion you have besmirched yourself as an individual and as a Senator, and thereby besmirched that body by wallowing in the gutter and using a foul phrase coined by that paragon of journalism, the Daily Worker in a futile effort to make a point versus an opponent.

While I agree with you in your opposition to the so-called foreign aid bill this makes us strange bedfellows and your opposition to this bill and to remarks alleged to Secretary of State Dean Rusk certainly does not begin to justify your calumny against the memory of a dedicated American who served his country in war and peace, in the Armed Forces and in civilian life, as an outstanding public servant.

In this article you are quoted as stating Rusk's alleged remarks "one of the most unfortunate by a responsible Government official in many years." The above being true (debatable) in what position are you placed by your calumny against the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, assuming, of course, that you are a "responsible Government official."

You and others with views not understandable continue to spout the venom which the enemies of Senator McCarthy brought to a head with the ill-advised and later repudiated Senate censure. Over the years Senator McCarthy has been proven right "again and again and again" and it is apparent that this vindication is as a "bone in your throat."

To apologize you should stand in front of a mirror and first render an apology to your image so reflected, then stand on the Senate floor, as a man would, and apologize to that body and the Nation.

From California:

SENATOR MORSE: The March 13 edition of the Stars and Stripes carried the report of your speech to the Senate that you delivered March 10 on the Vietnam policy. I respect your right to your opinions as I hope you do mine. This letter will undoubtedly mean little as you already have your own ideas but it will have served its purpose in the fact that it has allowed me to blow off a little steam, and maybe, just maybe, you'll take a closer look and come out with a different understanding of our country's stand in Vietnam.

The article begins with the bold headline: "Senator Morse Raps Vietnam Policy, calls American Deaths 'Murder'." The headline wasn't very much in comparison to the first sentence which stated, "Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate Tuesday that 'all of South Vietnam isn't worth the life of one American boy' and called the mounting list of U.S. troop fatalities there an issue of 'murder'."

I'm in the service and stationed at an airbase in Japan; quite a ways from Vietnam and the fighting that goes on there. I live in comparative safety and comfort to the people that are stationed in Vietnam. I don't really know how they feel or how I would feel if I was there. I should probably thank God that I am not there. The greater share of servicemen stationed in Vietnam probably know that they are there for a good cause. That has probably drawn a big smirk to your lips knowing what you believe. To be able to do the job they have so far done they must have been able to say to themselves "It is important to my country that I am here," and know and believe in this. It is just as important for me to believe that my being here in Japan has some purpose, it would be nice to be back in the States helping to protect the continental United States from aggression. Japan, Vietnam, Korea, Guam, Wake, France, Germany, and many other countries are buffers between us and the Big Bear. We

need them just as much as they need us. Communism is a lot like a cancer. The cancer must be held in tow and not allowed to grow in any area or it will eventually consume the whole body. Tarawa and other Pacific islands too numerous to mention were worthless pieces of land as land goes. None of them were worth the life of an American but nobody argued that fact that it had a purpose for which some Americans had to die. That purpose was to stop a growing cancer and it was achieved. A new cancer formed when the other had been destroyed. As long as there is such a country as America there will be reforming cancers, I have no wish to die but if it takes my life or my son's life or his son's or maybe some kids across the country to keep the U.S.S.R. from sailing into New York harbor, isn't it worth the price?

I appreciate any time and consideration you have given this letter.

Yours truly,

MARCH 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you wholeheartedly for your protest against our policy in Vietnam. It was shocking to us to hear Secretary of Defense McNamara say that the U.S. Government and the people are with you. What right has he to speak for all the American people? Have you read "The Furtive War" by Mildred Burkett, also the article by Edgar Snow "The War in Vietnam"? We feel so deeply that the time has come when we must rethink this entire policy of war and find the way out. If we don't, the only alternative is nuclear disaster. Is this the best our so-called civilization can offer? Thanks again. Could you send us copy of remarks?

We also commend you for statements made in protest against Adolph Heusinger's appointment as actual head of NATO. We have read "Heusinger of the Third Reich" by Chucks Allen, Jr., with foreword by Hugh B. Hrater, brigadier general U.S. Army retired. The latter has made it very clear how dangerous he considers this appointment.

From Ohio:

MARCH 19, 1964.

DEAR MORSE: Stone's Weekly, March 16, 1964, carries abridgement of your March 4 speech on war in Asia. For whatever it is worth, I agree fully with quoted remarks. For me, we have long been far too busy trying to run the affairs of too many peoples. To assist them to help themselves is a worthy objective. But we've done too much more than this under the "umbrella" of anti-communism which can be made to mean anything we want it to mean. We need to cut out so-called military aid.

Sincerely,

From Washington:

MARCH 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand against deeper involvement in Vietnam is in keeping with other wise policies you have advocated—more power to you.

I have sent editorials from the local paper and petitions bearing signatures expressing the same judgment to President Johnson. He should know that many people are doubtful of this thing.

Yours with great appreciation,

From New York:

MARCH 21, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bless you for your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

P.S.—I have written to President Johnson to ask him to appoint you Secretary of State.

From California:

MARCH 18, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you that we have no business in South Vietnam and the sooner we withdraw our military aid, the better for us all. We lost too many Americans already without extending the war. We lost so many Americans in Korea where we did not belong, either. The people in South Korea threw out the one we placed in power and the same will happen in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

MARCH 16, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate and thank you for your speech in Congress with reference to the Vietnam situation. It is the most refreshing and sensible view, I have heard since we got involved in this senseless struggle, in contrast to some jingoistic proclamation that we carry the war to North Vietnam.

We have tried a similar phony war in Korea to great suffering of many American families. (My sister lost her only boy, of 18. There were other losses of near and dear ones, and to what end?) Did those youngsters fight for the honor and freedom of America? They had no idea what they were fighting for. They only knew, they had to kill or be killed.

Now, we are again involved in a useless, irrational struggle, which at best after the loss of many American lives, we can reach a deadlock, while at worst bring about a nuclear war.

I wrote to the President and a number of Senators, urging them to seriously consider the advice and efforts of General de Gaulle to bring about a settlement between North and South Vietnam, neutralize the entire area.

I do hope many American parents and people in general will begin to realize the real danger in the policy we are pursuing and demand that the Government bring their loved ones back home.

Thank you again.

Very sincerely,

MARCH 18, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your one-man fight against our Government's ill-advised assistance in Vietnam is most commendable. There are many people here in my community who endorse your stand and hope that you continue your efforts on our behalf.

Very sincerely,

From New York:

MARCH 20, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Cheers. Your sensible, courageous and necessary speech on Vietnam was the most cheering voice from Washington I've encountered in some time. How can our Government be so shortsighted and self-defeating? Unhappily I've seen only excerpts from your speech—would it be possible for me to have a copy of it all?

I'm venturing to enclose a letter I wrote to the Times. I've had an astonishing¹ response to it—phone calls and letters and requests to join discussion gatherings. I'm convinced that there is deep disquiet about the situation, as there well might be, since as long ago as March 1962 the Wall Street Journal reported what it said was the Penta-

¹ Not in volume of course—but all favorable.

gon's plan for "escalation" against "Red territory."

Although I'm a long way from Oregon would it be possible for me to receive your Newsletter? I'd appreciate it.

Sincerely,

VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL URGED; EVENTS BELIEVED TO INDICATE NEITHER LEADERS NOR PEOPLE WANT OUR HELP

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Reporting to the House Armed Services Committee on January 27, Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

"In the case of South Vietnam our help is clearly wanted, and we are deeply engaged in supporting the Vietnamese Government and people in their war against the Communist Vietcong. * * *

Surely Secretary McNamara meant to say "our help is clearly not wanted," for almost as he was speaking the Government which presumably wanted our help to keep fighting was overthrown by another military coup, and the Times reported this event in headlines which read: "Vietnam Junta Ousted by Military Dissidents Who Fear Neutralism."

In other words, the generals whom our Government supported in their coup to replace the Diem government which was beginning to "flirt with neutralism" began in turn to incline toward the same policy. If anything seems clear in this grim situation it is that our Government is finding it increasingly difficult to find even military leaders who "clearly want our help" to continue their fratricidal strife.

As for the Vietnamese people, it has never been their war. If reports in the Times (and our news weeklies) have made anything clear, it is that the Vietnamese people have supported the war so little that a ruthless policy of forcing them into fortified villages was introduced to prevent them from helping the guerrilla fighters. And the so-called Vietcong may or may not be Communists, or pro-Communist, but they are unquestionably Vietnamese.

LACK OF OUTCRY

The situation in Vietnam is so unworthy of us that the apparent lack of popular outcry against it suggests a condition of indifference and moral callousness few of us would have believed possible only a few years ago. It is this growing apathy and callousness that is the true enemy of the values we hold dear.

The U.S. Government should at once present the problem of Vietnam to the U.N. Security Council and should withdraw our military advisers and stop providing millions of dollars a day to keep a war going.

If our leadership means only destruction and death for the people who live in distant areas our commentators call "strategic real estate" our Nation will go down in history as just another rampaging great power, self-convinced that our might makes right. And it will not be the Communists who will have betrayed us. It will have been ourselves.

From Pennsylvania:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I approve of your stand to withdraw our men from Vietnam. I wish there were more men like you in Congress and Senate. Out of about 15 neighbors not one approves of our meddling and sending troops all over world. What business have we in Korea?

I would like to see a man like you as President of our country.

I am opposed to the conscription law called selective service except when country is at war.

Only Congress has the right to declare war; to hell with police actions like Korea.

Where one writes you as I am doing, thousands intend to, but put it off and neglect to do so.

This from a combat veteran that has seen many men killed and to hell with foreign aid.

From Ohio:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I recently wrote a large article about withdrawing our armies from all over the world and set this program out and the revolutionary people overthrow their government and not until they go down in defeat. The sooner we learn to do as our first President warned the Nation to do, the better off we will be. No tangling alliances are necessary. I am glad you and Senator GRUENING stand for this type of thing. Stay by the program that is outgrowth of Christ's sayings. All I can think of there ruling people is they are tools of Satan and getting the country into deeper debt all the time. Wish you would let Mr. GRUENING read the enclosed also.

Just thought I ought to let you know something perhaps that no one ever has told you before and something which I never yet have run across—a person able to say this same thing and twice have I traveled through the near east—14 countries the first time and 15 countries the second time. It is this: In October of 1915 one night at 11 p.m. and our Lord Jesus Christ came into my home. I was so dumb struck that I could not talk or open my mouth. He stayed 1 minute and never said one word and turned and went out the same way he came in.

I have been talking about His coming ever since and the only way to escape this next war which will be "Hell" is by being a baptized believer in Him and loving and looking forward to His coming. You will be caught up to meet Him at the marriage feast otherwise you stay behind. I wish you would pass this information around so that many people will be saved.

I would like to describe His appearance and if you are interested I will write you and tell about His looks and again three pictures I got in a dream of April 1917—which showed me the breakdown of this civilization and His coming and that I was to live to see it. Could tell you a lot more but maybe you are disinterested from this standpoint. Anyway it is true.

Best wishes,

LETTER ON PRICE FIXING DRAWS COMMENT

To the Editor:

This is a short reply to a letter on price fixing written by a Mr. Frank Krucia, which appeared in your interesting column "Voice of the People," a few weeks ago.

Mr. Krucia, I can understand having read your letter that you have had little or no experience in conducting a business.

You should try it for just 3 months and look "much encouraged?" at your red and black figures.

NEW ORDER NEEDED TO ACHIEVE WORLD PEACE

To the Editor:

"Where there is no vision, the people perish."

This saying fits into our times, and especially does it fit the political leaders of our country. Sight into the future only comes by observing what the great planners laid down as rules and laws to be carried out in our relationship with men and nations.

Supernatural thinking that comes through a divine relationship is lacking among our political, as well as other leaders.

Viewing a Meet the Press program, clearly left one with the impression that Secretary Ball is only in hopes that what we do will be successful in preventing the spread of communism around the world.

Not one of the candidates who have spoken thus far seem to know what to do in this reshuffled political world.

Doing only what has been done in the past will not bring peace even if we won all the wars and subdued all peoples, something impossible to do. Not by might nor by power can we settle things. A new order is being born and will take the place of old methods which is "By My Spirit" sayeth the Lord. Unless this type of person is elected to the Presidency, failure stares the country in the face.

We may have one more chance to get right with our "Maker" and he who is elected must be a dictator for a short period of time, until he reverses the trend toward disaster.

Our soldiers must be withdrawn from all the nations of the earth, even to the point of recalling our representatives. This will leave the world ripe for communism, and then they will be overextended to such an extent that a revolt will overthrow the present Communist leaders, and out of the chaos, all nations will have a rebirth. The expense of keeping armies in other countries can be spent at home.

The Monroe Doctrine can be carried out to the fullest degree and we can follow instructions as given to the Nation by our first President, which was to refrain from entangling alliances with other nations.

In 1914 the First World War was started and we remained out of it until April 1917. At this time, England and France were losing the war, and to save the big bankers (who loaned money to them) from losses, we entered the war.

Again on December 7, 1941, we entered the Second World War for same reasons. We sold our war equipment and supplies to them.

Our armies are in countries around the world, and we are overextended, for sole purpose of saving the world for democracy. Our economic system will not stand the strain—and high prices and inflation will be the result.

Better select the right person who has the vision this time, and one who will stand upon the above-mentioned plants of a real platform.

THE SUN IS A COLD BODY WITH A GLORIFIED BAND OF LIGHT AROUND IT—THE SUN IS NOT A HOT BODY

In ancient times men thought of the sun as a gaseous ball of fire coming up in the east in the morning and going down in the west in the evening. They thought of heat from the sun as warming the earth and affecting all life: vegetable, animal, and human.

Seasons were formed by the sun's movement north and south in its path from east to west. In recent centuries it was revealed to men that the sun was not in movement around the earth but that the opposite was true. The earth revolved on its axis once in 24 hours in its path or orbit around the sun at the speed of 18½ miles per minute. The sun, likewise, is traveling in its orbit carrying along its nine satellites of which the earth is one. At a tremendous speed it is estimated that it takes 40,000 years to complete one orbit. The North Star holds the axis of the earth in line, thereby causing the different seasons. The more direct cosmic rays from the sun bring about a higher degree of heat in the atmosphere of the earth, as well as other planets.

If the sun was hot because of gases and inflammable materials being burned, it could not have continued through the ages as it has. It would have burned itself out long ages ago. If, as has been thought the sun's temperature could be in the neighborhood of 40,000°, and that the flames from the burning gases extend a hundred thousand miles from the surface, then again the sun would not exist today.

An eclipse of the sun occurs when the moon is between the sun and the earth in line with each other. Likewise, an eclipse of the moon occurs when the earth is between the sun and the moon in line with each other. The eclipse of the sun always occurs in the daytime, the eclipse of the moon always at night.

The size of the sun, earth, and moon, and the distances between them indicate they exist in size today as they were made in the beginning by the Great Architect. So naturally, we must assume again the sun has not shrunk in size. Therefore, we must project or think out a more reasonable theory, which is that the sun is a body a million miles in diameter with a glorified cold lightband around it, and cannot be consumed nor ever shall be until it has served the Great Creator's purposes or plans. No deterioration of its intense light has been observed in our civilization or history except black spots observed from time to time. On one occasion there was a complete blackout of the sun that occurred at the time of the crucifixion of Christ.

Again we must say, it remains as it was made in the beginning of time. A firefly gives a cold light just as some fish of the sea are known to have this florescence, lighting the waters around them. This again shows the power of the Great Creators.

We have recorded in history on many occasions where cold light manifested itself.

1. The burning bush that was not consumed, seen by Moses, a cold glorified light. Exodus 3: 2, 3.

2. The cold glorified light seen by the wise men of the east led them to Bethlehem where the child Jesus was born. Matt. 2: 1-10.

3. The cold glorified light observed by the shepherds as the glory of the Lord when they were told to go into the city to see that which was come to pass. Luke 2: 8-10.

4. The cold glorified light manifesting itself on the Mount of Transfiguration, when Jesus Christ was glorified having with him Peter, James and John who later told and wrote their experiences. Matt. 17: 1-6.

5. The cold glorified light in tongues of fire on the day of Pentecost. Acts 2: 1-6.

6. The cold glorified light used on Saul of Tarsus compelling him to change his whole course of life from a persecutor to a preacher of the gospel. Acts 9: 1-6.

7. The cold glorified light in which Christ will come soon when the armies gather in the Near East to judge the nations and set up His Kingdom on earth. Matt. 24: 30.

These demonstrate the cold light theory. Nothing was consumed by the fiery glorified light but did bring fear to those who saw these things. Therefore we again conclude there is no heat that originates in the sun. Consequently, there is a band of glorified light around the sun which is never consumed and has always remained to give light to the planets revolving around it.

If the sun is a cold body which it is, plus the glorified band then all we can receive from the sun is light. The space between our earth and the sun is a cold complete vacuum. It is known that light emanates from its source through a vacuum to a more efficient degree. Again, no heat could come through a cold vacuum 93 million miles and reach the earth. If the sun were a hot body that shed heat upon the earth the mountain tops would be the first to feel the effects of that heat. There could be no ice upon these high mountain tops as there is today. In the record of creation in Genesis, the sun is called the greater light that rules the day.

Radio and television bring us sound and pictures from thousands of miles in less than a second of time. We must come to the conclusion that there exists a band of light particles moving very fast around the earth from east to west. Lightning, which is trapped particles of light compressed, always shines out of the east and travels westward. Our earth travels west to east on its axis and

through space $1\frac{1}{4}$ million miles in a 24-hour period or about 73,000 miles per hour. The particles of light making up this light band of microwaves are not seen by the eyes of man. They can go through most material substances without hindrance. These must have a uniform shape and I would suggest they are saucer shaped and that they face up to the sky.

When the sun is higher more light reflects itself on the face of the saucer, thereby heating or warming the nitrogen and oxygen and hydrogen, which make up 99 percent of our atmosphere.

More heat is generated in summer than in winter because the cosmic rays of light from the sun shines on more of the surface of the saucer shaped particles of light. Magnets must be used to pull the minute particles of light to them. We can then induce these particles of light through an induction coil to come out of the magnets. The speed of the coil picks up the particles of light, compresses them and the result is electricity. Electricity in the solid disintegrates very rapidly and becomes particles of light again. Eight minutes of time is consumed for light to travel from our sun to the earth. Again, we must say and conclude that it is light from the sun shining upon particles of light that brings about climatic changes upon the surface of the earth.

When on the fourth day of creation as recorded in Genesis, God made two great lights, one to rule the day and the other to rule the night. These give light upon the earth for the purpose of dividing the day from the night or the light from the darkness. The moon is not a glorified body of itself but does reflect the light from the glorified sun. If there was heat emitting from the sun planets nearest would be much hotter. The heat on the other planets is regulated by the density of the radiation band of light particles revolving around them on which the light from the sun shines. Therefore, we must and can assume that many can land on any planet, the sun included, and will not be harmed by atmospheric conditions. When a person looks upon the dark spots upon the sun you can get a glimpse of what the entire sun is under the glorified light which of itself has no heat whatsoever.

From Washington, D.C.:

MARCH 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your realistic approach on the Vietnam situation and your efforts to insist that the facts in this tragic situation be brought to the American people are greatly appreciated.

We do not want to kill, or to be killed; nor do we feel justified in being involved in this Asian war. U.S. troops do not belong in Vietnam.

In this, the nuclear age, negotiation is the only solution to international problems. Obviously our way is not a good way; obviously, your suggestions that we cease fighting a senseless civil war and use the available facilities for a negotiated settlement will prevail if the true facts are more generally known and understood.

To you, and to your supporting colleagues, thanks.

From Massachusetts:

MARCH 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The "falling domino" theory would have it that, relinquishing South Vietnam, we would soon lose south-east Asia.

And as I see it in time Malaysia would be lethally embraced by the Indonesian expansionists from the south, while the Chinese—

including the Vietcong—would absorb the mainland, even to Singapore.

Perhaps we should write it off and let them do what they will, for otherwise, we'll be bogged down for years; an endless drain of both men and money.

Leaving them to stew in their own rice paddies we would gain this benefit: A big mobile battle wise force which might conceivably be aimed at Cuba (although I think we are too late for that there).

I have unorthodox opinions regarding colonialism: It would have been better had we not repealed the Platt amendment, instead we should have so Americanized the island that we would have almost owned it. "Realpolitik" is oftentimes best. I have lived in Cuba and know a lot about northern Camagüey Province, and was surprised that the unfortunate Bay of Pigs invasion took place; surprised that paratroopers were not used, for, as you know, Cuba averages a little over a hundred miles across its 750-mile length.

We should take the long look at invasions and land grabbing from reading history, and observing the (generally) beneficial results that are imposed by Western nations on the less civilized. Algeria is on a subsistence level now. Under the French, railroads were built, sewer lines installed, magnificent buildings, boulevards, and measures taken against the creeping Sahara. The heritage of the Dutch in Indonesia is roughly similar; the British left India a viable country despite the almost inevitable oppressions of a colonial power.

I think this country, too, has gained immeasurably by the colonial process since the 1600's. The export money from Amsterdam and London certainly was a potent factor in early development; and, in the 19th century a lot of money came from abroad—along with the immigrants—to make possible the transcontinental railroads, the big ranches of Texas, and development of cities.

I believe we should retrench in foreign aid (and use some of that money in, say, "Appalachia" instead). Let each payment be scrutinized to each country. What would the cut be to the oligarchy? How much would filter down to those who need it? We should get a quid pro quo. Perhaps the Peace Corps should handle more of these funds, and have some of their members be auditors for fiscal work. Selectivity in foreign aid: "What do we get out of it?" should be at the top of our mind.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

From New York State:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your forthright attack on the appalling Vietnam policy of our Government deserves the support and commendation of every American.

It is appalling to think that the brave old jingos in our Senate and in the Pentagon are willing to let countless young men die and rot in that miserable war simply to prove a reckless anticommunism.

I hope you will continue to try to lead us into some sort of sanity.

Cordially,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not from your State, I would like to thank you for your stand on Vietnam, and ask you to continue your efforts for withdrawing our troops.

Our position is unjust and the methods (backed by the United States) are loathsome. I have written to Senator Javrs to register my opposition to our involvement in Vietnam's affairs, but I doubt that he paid any attention to my letter. Senator KEATING has never represented me or my views and I didn't even bother to let him know how I feel about this.

Please do not let Secretary Rusk's smear techniques deter you, but continue to make your points loud and clear. Perhaps the American public will listen to you.

Thank you.

From Connecticut:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I have written to President Johnson to tell him I agree with your position on Vietnam. Your courage and wisdom in this matter has been an inspiration.

On Thursday I saw an AP photo of a Vietnamese soldier holding his badly burned baby in his arms. The baby was burned by American bombs, dropped by American planes, used in a war financed by Americans. The planes were strafing the village in an attempt to flush out guerrillas who "sought to hide among innocent civilians." No picture could better display the total moral bankruptcy of our policy in Vietnam.

I pray President Johnson will realize the enormity of our crime against the people of Vietnam and seek peace through negotiation. Gratefully.

From Ohio:

Senator Morse: The absolute need to pare down foreign aid is very much with us in this session of Congress.

Your fight for this need draws much basic sympathy from the American public. The needs in Vietnam and related areas of Asia must be looked into in the light of domestic needs. New views and more vigorous anti-Communist policies must be talked about fully.

Is it really true that our worldwide position vis-a-vis to communism and to our allies will be compromised by spending less money here?

I doubt that very much.

There is such a thing as exaggerating dangers in order to justify outlays. The foreign program in many cases has been a near failure. In other areas it has proved valuable.

The point you must take up in Congress is the golden road of minimum expenditure with maximum international security. Realistically speaking. Not with the eternally pessimistic view of our military spenders.

We have poured much treasure and some blood in these areas of the world. It is time to look honestly at the fruits. I dare say what we have here is simply a compromise. Is this the best policy in the long-term sense?

Is it enough to close the door to Communist infiltration and self-styled wars of liberation? Are we to pour aid ad infinitum into a delaying or holding action here? Is this the best our planners can present us with? Is this the limit of their resourcefulness?

Are we the prisoners of our own fears of a nuclear war? Every time a vigorous step is advocated the cry goes up of such steps escalating into world wars.

Apparently the Reds have no such inhibitions. They start all sorts of local bonfires and we are forced to do their bidding by fighting their kind of scrap.

Anyone who believes that Russian or Chinese long-term policies calls for a nuclear showdown with a superior United States over Cambodia or North Vietnam or in any other peripheral area of the Red Empire is to me a fool of the nuclear jitters or irresponsible. These are hard times and hard times require stern and hard tasks. We must go on and on. We must decide if the interest of historical democracy and democratic causes can be served by piecemeal efforts such as we have in Vietnam. I trust you will bring these questions to the fore of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: How can we, the people, thank you that you have had the guts to address the so-called sacred persons and departments of the administration (March 3 and 4) by telling them the unminced, blunt truth about Vietnam, that we should get out of there, that in first place we never should have gotten in, that it would be disastrous to escalate that war to the north of South Vietnam. Also then we should not "get back" China.

Why does nobody in the administration listen to this reasonable argument? Why do they think that the world is still in the year 1900 and nothing has changed since then?

Please, Senator Morse, we common people urge you to insist upon your right opinion and repeat it, repeat it, repeat it, very loudly until even the dead would hear it—the dead and the miserably tortured in that unhappy country, where the Americans are not without guilt, rather.

Then I wish fervently to urge you to concentrate your strength and courage on hindering the event of conveying nuclear weapons and control over them to Germany (Bonn) via NATO. Then the world would really be near the brink and soon over the brink. I think you know that.

So we are proud to have once in a while a reasonable and just thinking Senator or Congressman who speaks out what is what. Plain language is fine; louder and more often, please.

Wishing you success, I am,
Very sincerely,

From New Jersey:

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I stayed out of the controversy over Vietnam until I read the New York Times this morning. Now I take pen in hand.

I want you to know that I am writing President Johnson and my own Senators (CASE and WILLIAMS) urging the modification of our policy to the point of seeking a multinational settlement agreement, and that there be no expansion of the sanguine conflict.

The governing regime in Saigon, like its predecessors, lacks majority popular support; and no essential American interests are at stake there. The frightful logic of our remaining there leads either to defeat or willful expansion of the war—which means ultimate final defeat for mankind.

For the true notes you sound, my heartfelt thanks.

Respectfully yours,

From Nebraska:

"Man longs for a moral order, logically supported."—Hugo Black.

Re "The U.S. decision to pull out most of the 15,000 troops in Vietnam by 1965 had official Washington split down the middle. State Department and White House advisers were against it (they thought it would have a bad effect on the Saigon Government). Defense Secretary McNamara argued it would spur the Vietnamese into becoming self-reliant. L.B.J. backed McNamara."—Newsweek, March 2, page 10, Periscope.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo N times!

When I read the above, I was delighted and thought L.B.J. should invite McNamara to the vice presidency position on the ticket.

The White House advisers had better think in terms of the United States of America be-

fore either bad or good effects on Saigon—where we have absolutely no business as you have declared. L.B.J.'s advisers are going to maneuver him into a defeat as they are war minded. The people have always been peace minded. Truman knew he couldn't be reelected because of Korea. Stevenson will never believe that Eisenhower was elected because his speechwriter, John Emmet Hughes cleverly inserted "If elected, I will go to Korea * * *" implying a ceasefire. The ladies thronged to the polls, 3 million who'd never voted before, marked only Eisenhower's name. Idiot Stevenson insists it was his military glamour that elected him. Bunk. It was the implied ceasefire. You have access to L.B.J.; please explain the parallel. Saigon can easily be turned into another Korea, and if it is, L.B.J. will be voted out. Even if McNamara has now changed his mind, and is going to push the war, it doesn't change the fact that he was right the first time. Our boys must be removed from Saigon, from Vietnam at the earliest possible moment. L.B.J. will assure his reelection if he does; he will assure his defeat if he does not. Let him learn to spit in the warmongers' eyes—and to discharge any adviser who is not peace minded.

If McNamara comes out again for returning our boys to the United States of America, home, where they belong, he will be best Republican candidate, and he will be elected. L.B.J. better understand this. Where U.S. troops are needed; in the South. It is horrifying to read the Student Voice reporting one murder of our colored relatives after another and the late President's scared brother running about doing nothing. U.S. racists killed his brother and we hear nothing of the Justice Department investigating this barbarity. We have so much to do at home, it ill behooves us to be meddling abroad anywhere. The United States of America needs political leadership that does not think about votes but about justice—economic justice—for the people. If President Johnson forgets the election, and proceeds to serve justice, his White House occupancy will be extended by a landslide.

Enclosed copy of letter to unspeakable DIRKSEN..

Sincerely,

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: At a "Meet the Press" type broadcast, you indicated the United States of America could not get out of Vietnam.

United States of America can and should get out of Vietnam because it has no business in Vietnam in the first place and but for the likes of demented Spellman determined to make Catholics out of Buddhists would not be there.

Nearby China has kicked out Vatican adherents—Spellman's outfit is after China, too; and, of course, the Rockefeller thieves miss their big take from the Orient.

The sooner U.S. boys are removed from Vietnam the better. Why don't you get into uniform and go there yourself? You and the likes of you whooping it up for death in Vietnam should be put right on the firing line.

A recent broadcast told about a Virginia couple who would not accept the body of their son the Army had sent back from Vietnam. Townsfolks who viewed the corpse said it was the boy. The parents finally brought themselves to face the tragic reality which they could not at first, and accepted their precious son's body. From here on these bereaved parents will know a living death. They will smile at people but in the privacy of their home they are stricken.

You and idiots like you are murderers. I hope you are defeated in the next election.

With unlimited repugnance,

From New York:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your views on our policy in Vietnam seems obvious enough to be self-evident. I hope they made it obvious that this policy has been conducted without consulting the public who pay for it.

Senator GOLDWATER's experience in the New Hampshire primaries might be a clue as to what the public thinks of a hard line in Vietnam. If this is criticism then Secretary Rusk will have to make the most of it—most of the population then being traitors.

Respectfully,

From Wisconsin:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was very pleased to see on TV and in the press your vigorous stand on Vietnam.

I hope that you and your coworkers can put a stop to the sacrifice of the lives of American boys and the wasting of billions of the taxpayers money.

Sincerely,

From Illinois:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your major speech on Vietnam 2 or 3 weeks ago and for your determination to bring up the matter periodically from now on. I note that a small but growing number of Senators are joining you in speaking frankly about questions which are too often left under the rug.

Because you have been outstanding in your devotion to debate on foreign policy free of partisanship, I have enclosed an article which I wrote 2 weeks ago on the danger of partisanship over Vietnam. It largely ignores the possibility that the administration's policy is already rigidly set simply for fear of any domestic outcry—the fact that the threat of partisanship is as good as partisanship itself in limiting foreign policy to the line of least resistance.

It was also too early to take note of the fact that Senator GOLDWATER has indulged in exactly what was feared: the demand that the war be won and labeling, in so many words, the Johnson administration, "appeasers" for not doing so.

The prospects, in other words, are grim. I wish you well in your series of foreign policy speeches.

Sincerely yours,

The newspaper article follows:

[From the Daily Illini, Mar. 11, 1964]

PARTISAN DANGER

(By Gary Porter)

The startling victory of Ambassador Lodge in the New Hampshire primary should make the Republican Party think deeply about its strategy for this election year.

It makes the use of the Vietnamese war in the campaign a dubious proposition at best, for if Lodge is indeed a serious contender for the party's nomination—as the rejection of the hard campaigners indicates—then it would seem a foolish thing for Republicans to stress too strongly an issue with which he is so closely identified.

In their campaigns thus far, neither GOLDWATER nor Rockefeller have said much about Vietnam; in fact, GOLDWATER has apparently been totally silent on the subject. Rockefeller has asked Ambassador Lodge to come home and "tell us what is wrong." Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN avoided any direct mention of Vietnam in issuing a statement for the Republican leadership which referred to "President Johnson's continuing the late Mr. Kennedy's highly questionable policy of coexistence with the Communist world."

There is not enough in what has happened so far within the Republican Party to conclude that Republican candidates are going to use Vietnam as a campaign issue, but the possibility cannot be discounted. If it does happen, the partisan attack will take the form of demanding that the United States win the war in southeast Asia and threatening implicitly to raise hell if there is any withdrawal from that frustrating exercise.

Such a campaign could be successful; it would blame the whole mess on the Democratic administration and, while not taking any concrete position on policy alternatives, would stand for "victory." The obvious effect of such a strategy would be unusual pressure on President Johnson to either extend the war into North Vietnam or inform the American people that no drastic measures are necessary in order to win.

This partisan danger will remain until or unless Lodge makes public his intention of being a candidate. Partisanship in foreign policy always involves the possibility of mischief in our foreign policy because of two facts.

The first fact is that the American people as a whole do not themselves have the means to grasp the complexities of foreign affairs; they too often judge issues only on the basis of what they would like to happen rather than what is actually possible. They are accordingly susceptible to deception at the hands of men whose immediate motives are the interests of a party rather than of a nation.

The second fact is that American foreign policy cannot in the long run rise above the level of the American people. Except in an emergency and where the need for a particular action is unambiguous to the Executive, foreign policy will be limited by the moods and perceptions of the people.

Taken together, these two facts make for the "extraordinary power of domestic politics—to subvert foreign policy," of which Prof. Norman Graebner has written. And the partisan danger was never so clear as today, when a campaign based on the loss of Vietnam seems to offer such political gains.

It should not be necessary to demonstrate that neither course is wise in order to show that no President should have to contend with domestic agitation which excludes a third possibility. Such public pressure would be purely political in origin, for it would not develop out of mature discussion of the issue.

This is partisanship in the most pejorative sense of the word, for it violates the spirit of bipartisanship which has stood as the standard for American politics since the end of the war. I say "the spirit," because I do not mean to indict even the deepest differences between parties over foreign policy and criticism based on those differences.

What is condemnable is the charge of weakness and incompetence against an administration when a particular policy is clearly failing. Pointing out that the policy was misguided to begin with, or why and how it must be changed—these are all legitimate functions of political parties. But the kind of approach which we may see over Vietnam neither takes responsibility for a party stand nor wishes to see the issue fairly analyzed; it is based on the notion that when an American project abroad goes wrong—even though it may involve vast social and political forces over which we have little or no influence—the fault lies in the State Department or the White House.

We saw the ugly and disrupting effects of this kind of partisanship after the fall of China; it seriously impaired our ability to deal in any objective way with the Chinese problem for many years. But the partisanship over China came well after the 1948

election. We might ask ourselves what might have been the impact of an outraged Republican Party crying "appeasement" during the campaign of that year.

As I said before, it would be premature to accuse Republicans of plotting partisan campaigns over Vietnam, but there is ample precedent for it. It is a damaging commentary on the state of our politics if it takes a major act of statesmanship or Henry Cabot Lodge to keep them from it. I am not suggesting for a moment that President Johnson's opposition stop their "bellyaching" and be kind to him on foreign affairs. I am simply saying that there is no justification for the absurdity of a campaign which would substitute accusation for debate.

From Ohio:

MARCH 20, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: My salute to you, sir, for your courageous and forthright stand on more aid to Vietnam.

I hold with you that the conflict there cannot be won, and further, if it could what would we have that would prove advantageous?

We cannot hope to win without the active and eager aid of the South Vietnamese peasant and from what I've read and seen on television that aid is now firmly pledged to the Vietcong. Ho beat the best France could afford and those foreign legionnaires are real good fighting men.

Seems to me that our aid adds up to soft living for several thousand U.S. civilians, hardship and death to many of our military people, and keeps a bunch of South Vietnamese politicians in fancy uniforms, palaces, women, and booze.

I am for trying to turn loose of this tar baby.

Sincerely yours,

From Pennsylvania:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A heartfelt word of appreciation from a family of three for all you have said on Vietnam. This comes from a family who are better informed than the average, and who read extensively comments of the world's press, and the material of the major peace groups.

We wish you would add one thing, the next time you speak on Vietnam. When we see the photographs of refugees, of Vietnamese in the concentration camps—strategic hamlets—of the wounded and dead, we cringe, and know ourselves to be morally guilty. We think you should say that those who are pressing the war in Vietnam, and this includes Johnson and McNamara, are guilty of genocide, and one day they will be tried by a world court, just as the Nazis are today tried for genocide. It may take a little longer—simply because the Vietnamese are "yellow," but tried they will be one day.

And at least the Alloys and MORSE will be able to say "Not guilty."

We cannot understand Senator CLARK's silence, and we have written to him, urging him to speak up, and to prop up Senator MANSFIELD, who collapses every time the administration scolds him. Perhaps you can persuade CLARK and MANSFIELD to join you.

Sincerely,

From Kansas:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your recent honest and realistic evaluation of the situation in South Vietnam. May I urge you to expend every effort to get some sanity into our foreign policy relative to Asia.

Truly yours,

March 30

6382

From Minnesota:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Well, I don't always agree with you, but thanks for telling the truth about Vietnam.

Respectfully,

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I write you how proud I was to read in our local newspaper, The Schenectady Gazette that you had the courage to express your opinions about our present foreign policy in South Vietnam and the stand that Secretary Rusk takes that any citizens who disagree with our foreign policy are quitters and helpers of communism. I have written to our Senators and the President that I am much opposed to the continuation of the war in South Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

From Ohio:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my support for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam as called for by Senators Mansfield and Bartlett, and I believe favored by you too. Neutralization of Vietnam would be sought all the more if momentarily our position seems satisfactory, with more cooperative local leadership. The long history of guerrilla tactics with wide popular support and our expensive, potentially explosive stalemate make a major policy change imperative without crisis or new adverse pressures.

Strong nationalistic feelings are said to persist in this long divided country, abetted no doubt by the past presence of the French. North Vietnamese leaders have been seeking a path not solely committed to either Peking or Moscow. Such possibilities should be explored while they still persist. Ultimately, and basic to problems in all of southeast Asia is the need to open communication with Communist leadership and admission of Communist China to the U.N.

We need forthright public enlightenment on the realities involved in Vietnam instead of relying too long on the idealistic hopes of the Department of Defense and the State Department.

Very sincerely yours,

P.S.—I have also expressed these views to Senators MANSFIELD and BARTLETT and my State senators.

From New York:

MARCH 20, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On this morning's newscast of the "Today" program, I heard you express your views with respect to our policy in Asia, and the foreign aid program. I hope that many citizens heard you, and write you as I am, to support you. Keep it up, we need more like you in Washington.

Sincerely,

From Idaho:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on the war in Vietnam—why, oh why, do we get in messes like that in the first place.

I wonder, as you are part of this administration, if you can tell me just who is this "common man" the administration wants to help.

If it means folks like my family, who have worked a lot, saved a little and generally tried to be a paying member in good standing in the community; I suggest that a way of getting a "better deal" for us would be to get the burden of foreign aid off our backs, particularly in areas where we are being insulted daily. I'd suggest that we not jeopardize the future of our industries and farmers by allowing foreign products into the country at less than we can produce, in the name of "good foreign relations."

If the "common man" is the person the program on poverty is to appeal to, then I suggest that we, who up until now have considered ourselves the "middle class" will soon be brought down to a level of mediocrity and will bring children into the world who will not strive to better themselves, as the children of those who were on relief in the 1930's continue to breed children who see no point in working for salaries approximating their relief checks. In this connection, do you think the raising of the minimum wage rate might get some of these folks out of the house and to the employment office, to attempt to get the sort of jobs which appear to be plentiful (judging by ads in the city newspapers I see) laborers, dishwashers, et cetera.

I would appreciate your comments.

Very truly yours,

From New York:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for having the courage and honesty to stand up and say that we ought to get out of Vietnam. Please keep up the good fight. The whole country needs you.

Cordially,

From California:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We saw and heard you on TV and certainly agree with you, "We can't win the war in Vietnam," unless it is an all-out war and is it worth it? Here we have Cuba on our doorstep. What is being done? Castro, telling us off. Little Panama telling us off. It seems all any country wants is our money. We are sick of foreign aid. It does appear to only help the Communists to gain.

Our stand on some of the bills. Bill S. 1975. We would like to see this one pass.

We think all people should have civil rights. However, the civil rights bill we oppose—because we feel it does give too much power to the Federal Government.

We hear the Civil Liberties Union wants to do away with chaplains in the Armed Forces. We do indeed object to this. If they can't even have a chaplain to counsel with them, what are our boys fighting to save? Our only son is in the service of our country.

I think we are all weary with appeasement. What is being done about our men shot down in East Germany? What's going to be done? I get clippings and hear facts from Alaska, how the Communist fishing boats are about to put the fisherman out of business—our daughter teaches in a village of fishermen's homes.

May God help us all.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

From Maryland:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have so often admired your independent stand that I am sorry to disagree with you heartily about foreign aid. You have probably seen for

yourself the need for it in Asia. I was there in 1969 and felt that the terrible poverty there would live longer than our generation. The same thing is probably true in Latin America, which I have not seen. Today I read in Carl Rowan's book "The Pitiful and Proud" "I realized that logic and a sense of decency told me that . . . it would be a costly mistake for the United States to lessen economic aid." I wish you could see that.

Yours truly,

From Florida:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to thank you for your speech of March 4. You said what needed to be said.

The war in Vietnam is a wicked war. Our whole foreign policy is wrong—because it is based on a wrong assumption—i.e., that we have a duty to keep the world in line with our policies, and our interests.

Sincerely,

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: You have the support of all Americans in your remarks about Secretary Rusk. Just what policy is he talking about? We do not have a foreign policy and are in retreat everywhere in the world. The defeats are so regular it looks very much that, they might be planned that way. Is it un-American to ask, why we are always appeasing the Kremlin? Now, we are pleading for the release of the men shot down in East Germany and are ready to give away some advantage on travel permits to get them back.

The same appeasement policy now has Russia pointing their rockets at us from Cuba and setting up a powerful seismic complex capable of directing nuclear tests in Nevada. Their ultimate goal: Annual American defensive and offensive missile power. The caves in Cuba are full of missile tracking stations according to an article by Dr. Fernando Penabaz published in the Fort Lauderdale News of this date.

The billions we have spent to stop communism has now turned into help the Communists. The money that went into Poland and Yugoslavia has supported the Russian economy for the past 17 years. All foreign aid must stop.

Most respectfully,

Senator MORSE: I wish to compliment you on the talk you gave on television "Today" as to your thoughts on our spending of money and young American men in southeast Asia.

First man in the Government to talk like a down to earth man.

How in the world do we as a Nation expect to save everyone? Maybe they have a right to solve their own problems? Who are we to tell everyone how to live?

Let us get our own house in order. All Russia wants us to do is spend ourselves into bankruptcy and we sure are doing a good job.

Stay in there and fight for solid business ideas and keep United States safe.

Your truly,

From New York State:

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: As one of the signers of the open letter to President Kennedy on ending the war and bringing peace in Vietnam which was run in a number of newspapers last summer, I am in a position to report to you the continuing and growing support, throughout the country, of the pro-

posal to withdraw our forces and submit the problem to negotiation along the lines of the Geneva Convention.

I enclose a copy of that open letter (which you probably saw). More than 20,000 reprints of it were requested by various groups throughout the country and evidence of support has continued to pour in, even today. I can assure you that there is even stronger sentiment for our withdrawal from Vietnam, as proposed in your speech in the Senate, reported in the New York Times today, than there was last summer. People are becoming more informed as to the real issues, I think, thanks to your untiring efforts to maintain some semblance of reason in this confused situation.

With my full endorsement of your position (and that of eight registered voters in Connecticut with whom I have talked today) I send you my best wishes.

Sincerely,

From Illinois:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you. Thank you for your forthright brave words refusing to endorse the dangerous involvement of this Nation in the military operation in South Vietnam. Many of the American people do not wish to see this Nation so involved, but we have been fed the usual half-truths with the inference being that if we do not support this stupid intervention we are not patriotic Americans.

May I encourage you to raise your voice again and again. I am sure there are no political advantages to be gained by being a dissenter, but there is the satisfaction of knowing that you have given your support to what is right and good. Please take every opportunity to lead us away from this disaster toward which we are hurrying.

Respectfully,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of quite a few members in my community, I (we) wish to commend you in your admirable stand against the current Government policy of support in Vietnam, a very unwise policy to say the least.

Respectfully,

From Illinois:

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you from the bottom of my heart for your courageous statement against the continuation of the war in South Vietnam.

Please spare a moment to read the enclosed copy of my letter to the Eugene Register-Guard.

No reply to me is necessary. Time is too valuable and you are one who uses every minute well.

Sincerely yours,

EDITOR, LETTERS COLUMN, REGISTER GUARD,
Eugene, Oreg.

SIR: I am so grateful for the wisdom, courage and commonsense of the Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE, I cannot refrain from trying to reach as many citizens of Oregon as possible to say "Congratulations and thank you for electing Senator MORSE."

For almost 3 years his has been one of the few voices speaking out against the pointless, brutal and futile war in South Vietnam. Only recently have many other Senators and Congressmen joined him in the demand for a reevaluation of our policy in south Asia. Surely these voices of reason should be heeded by the administration. Negotiations for a peaceful settlement should be begun

at once either by the nations concerned in the area or by the United Nations.

You Oregonians are also to be congratulated for your choice of Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER. She, too, can be relied upon to speak out on vital issues with independence, sound reasoning, and concern for the health and welfare of people no matter where they live.

Very sincerely yours,

From Wyoming:

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On this morning's TV news, I saw and heard you make an excellent statement regarding Vietnam, and I want to express my agreement with what you said.

In strong and vigorous terms you said it was your belief that we might as well face up to the fact that what we are trying to do there cannot be done, and we should withdraw from there before more American lives are lost, and more U.S. dollars spent and wasted. You pointed out that Great Britain tried and failed; France tried and failed, and we will fail. To this, I add hearty agreement.

If we are going to fight the Communists, let's reserve our strength to do it in our own hemisphere, and it looks like we will have to do this in Cuba eventually.

And further, I want to take this opportunity to express myself on the matter of foreign aid. The newest request from the White House should be defeated. If we can't cut out foreign aid entirely, then pare this \$3 billion down at least 50 percent, and do that every year henceforward until it is gone entirely. We can use that money better right at home, in preparation against the Communist push, or even in that election year gimmick of the Democrats' war on poverty.

Respectfully,

(Carbon copies to Senator SIMPSON, of Wyoming; Senator McGEE, of Wyoming; Representative HARRISON, of Wyoming.)

From Florida:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse your stand on U.S. policy in southeast Asia and am in sharp disagreement with what appears to be the official policy.

Yours truly,

From California:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I didn't hear you but friends have spoken of the very excellent speeches you have made on Vietnam. I agree with your position and want to thank you.

Sincerely,

From Minnesota:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you. Thank you. I've just heard you on the "Today" show. My sentiments are like yours on the Vietnam situation. Such a waste of American money and men. Please continue to speak up. I'm sure there are thousands of us who feel this way. Let us hope and pray that something positive is done about this deplorable situation.

From South Carolina:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to your remarks about the participation of the United States in the Asian mess. I want to thank you for this forthright expression of views. It is rare among our lawmakers.

I am 83 years old and almost blind. It is refreshing to think we still have some old-fashioned ideas of the place of this country in the world.

Very sincerely,

From New York:

March 21, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courageous and desperately needed stand on our suicidal intervention in South Vietnam. At last.

Let us not be marched like sheep to the pasture (or like Jews to the concentration camps) without dialog and debate.

Please continue your fight vigorously. The American people do not wish to be involved in a war which can continue to kill hundreds (maybe thousands if the war is enlarged) in behalf of corrupt, self-seeking politicians with massive passive resistance to the war by the South Vietnamese people themselves.

I agree with your stand that we withdraw and allow the Vietnamese themselves to decide their fate.

Respectfully,

From Colorado:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to congratulate you on your position regarding U.S. policy in Vietnam.

It is time that this country got out of Vietnam and stayed out.

Our support of the series of rotten governments in Vietnam on the claimed basis that they really represent the people is sheer hypocrisy.

The only immediate solution is an agreement similar to that reached in the Laos situation.

Yours sincerely,

From California:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I saw in the Christian Science Monitor of March 16 that you and Senator GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, want to stop the war with China over Vietnam.

I agree. Thank you for your stand.

Yours truly,

From Illinois:

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Two or three days ago I chanced to hear you briefly on TV and note your remarks regarding foreign aid.

I wish to congratulate you upon the position you are taking concerning this great folly. Truly, as you said, may we take a long hard look before we pour more American funds abroad under the guise of helping other nations only to see it wasted upon foolish projects or go into the coffers of a few.

I am a Republican. This foolishness is not a partisan affair. I condemned the previous administration in this respect the same as the one now in power. To say 80 percent of our aid, so-called, will be spent in this country, providing more jobs, is lacking in truth and is dubious.

Thanks, Mr. Senator.

From Idaho:

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: It gives me a great pleasure to know the stand you have taken for years on the question of Vietnam.

I have traveled in Idaho about 6,000 miles in the last few months and I find very few people who support the war in southeast Asia. They all say we should get out of there.

6381

Never has high politics gambled so irresponsibly before with the very existence of mankind.

I think we are on a false track. Our main question is not how we got on it, but how can we get off, and make a fresh start.

I think we are getting in a trap, and we will find it very hard to get out if we wage war in North Vietnam. There is China with 750 million people, and happy to put 100-150 million men to fight that war, say nothing of Laos, Cambodia, Burma; yes even Soviet Union. Also, we have to reckon with French, too, she may not forget so easily why she left southeast Asia.

I don't think we are there to teach how to fight guerrilla war—but to learn it from the people who been fighting it for the last 25 years.

I value very much the stand you are taking in southeast Asia.

Very sincerely yours,

From Connecticut:

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your intelligent stand concerning our terrible foreign policy in South Vietnam.

I urge you to continue your efforts in this regard and hope that you may influence your fellow Senators and other members of the U.S. Government.

Very sincerely,

From Florida:

DEAR SIR: I hope you stick to your guns about reducing the amount of our foreign aid. We have given millions away and still we haven't kept them from going Communist. Even our allies go against us when it comes to trade with Cuba and other Communist countries. The American taxpayer is getting fed up with the whole program. How much longer can Uncle Sam be Santa Claus, especially when we are running our country into debt all the time.

Yours truly,

(Read attached article:)

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Mar. 2, 1964]

IS U.S. AID TO GREECE PAYING OFF?

ATHENS.—In Greece, long considered a firm friend of the United States, an old question was being raised again:

Can the United States really count on, as an ally, a country made strong and independent with U.S. foreign aid?

This doubt grew as mobs of screaming Greeks rioted before the U.S. Embassy and broke windows in an office of the U.S. Information Agency.

Since World War II, Greece has received \$3,051 million in U.S. economic and military aid. Only France, Britain, Italy, West Germany and Turkey have been helped more.

And, with only 8.4 million people, Greece has collected far more U.S. aid per capita than any other country—some \$360 per person.

In 1947, President Truman asked Congress for a new aid program for Greece. The billions given under the Truman doctrine are credited with saving the country from communism.

On March 4, students in Athens, some of them shouting Communist slogans, daubed a bronze statue of Mr. Truman with white-wash. Then they scrawled across it, "Yankee, go home."

In the rioting, two pictures of President Johnson were set afire.

Newspapers called sailors of the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean the floating policemen of American imperialism.

A scheduled 6-day visit of the fleet to the Greek port of Piraeus was quickly postponed.

In Salonica, 30,000 Greeks gathered to hear speakers denounce the United States.

Behind all this was the Greek belief that the United States was favoring Turkey in the dispute between the two countries over the island of Cyprus.

Most of the rioters were students. Many of their signs and slogans were pro-Communist. Greek police protected U.S. property but—under orders—did nothing to disperse the mobs.

FEBRUARY 18, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you not to ask for anything for myself, on the contrary, I am writing to pass some information and views on to you so you can evaluate and consider them for whatever they are worth. Sitting here as I am on duty in South Vietnam as I am, I sometime wonder if the people in the States are getting a complete and unabridged version of the news. From past experience I know that news is somewhat toned down by the time it is released for public information in the States. To one extent I appreciate this fact as I would not want my wife and children as well as my family and friends to know the full truth about the situation in this area. I believe it best that they be spared all of the worry which would be aroused by full and complete knowledge in detail of what is happening in this area. I do believe though that our lawmakers should have this knowledge made available to them. From some of the news received here in the past from the States it seems that they are either somewhat in the dark about affairs in this part of the world, or that they simply do not care. I prefer to believe that the news is not made available to them. I believe that all available information should be evaluated before any decisions on any matter should be made.

I digress from reading the letter, Mr. President, to say that this sergeant has with a keen insight, been presenting an evaluation of the practices of the American news media. His views are similar to the ones I have been presenting on this floor for a long time now. The American people are living in the dark, insofar as what is happening in South Vietnam is concerned—and not only insofar as what is happening in South Vietnam, but also insofar as what is happening in a good many other trouble spots in the world. If the American people only knew what is happening, it would not take them long to insist that there be a change in American foreign policy.

I return to the reading of the letter from this American sergeant:

There is an excellent English-speaking newspaper published in Saigon. I feel that this paper publishes as close to an unabridged sampling of the feelings of the Vietnamese people and the current news of southeast Asia as is obtainable. This newspaper will express a pat on the back when it is due, at the same time expressing a firm reprimand when it is deserving. This paper prints articles which attack as well as praise the policies of the United States, as well as Vietnam and many other countries. With your permission, periodically I will send you articles as well as editions of this paper along with my feelings on the matters concerned.

Inclosed you will find clippings from the February 17 edition concerning the Pershing Field blast and the Kinh-do-Capitol Theater bombing. The eyewitness report of the Pershing Field Blast clearly notes that the Vietnamese people knew that the bombing was to take place. The article on the Kinh-do-

Capitol Theater bombing was truly a dastardly act, taking out vengeance on defenseless women and children as well as the American troops (commonly referred to as advisers).

I digress from reading the letter, to state that my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], had much to say, the other day, about myths. I was sorry that his speech did not offer a blueprint plan in connection with the various points he discussed. As I said in my immediate reply to his speech, it was a good speech as far as it went, but it really left us in a state of semantic confusion, because the Senator from Arkansas did not really offer constructive proposals as substitutes for the policies he was criticizing. However, it was well that he pointed out that a good deal in our thinking on foreign policy is characterized by myths. For some years, here in the Senate, I have pointed out that the American people, by and large, have become victimized by dogmas—which is another term which describes the state the Senator from Arkansas obviously had in mind when he talked about myths that have come to prevail in respect to a great deal of American thinking on foreign policy. "Dogmas" or "myths"—I care not which term is used; but the fact is that we should choose a better program as a substitute for the myths or the dogmas.

One of the great myths, of course, is that the American troops in South Vietnam are "advisers." That is a lot of hogwash. In fact, it is worse than that, Mr. President; it is a lot of deception. These American boys in American military uniform, who are allegedly "military advisers" in South Vietnam are standing shoulder to shoulder in place after place in mortal danger with South Vietnamese soldiers; and they are getting killed, too.

So the sergeant was quite correct when he made the very subtle comment about the so-called "advisers."

I read further from his letter:

The article on the Kinh-do-Capitol bombing in the 18 February edition clearly shows by the way that the Vietnamese policeman left prior to the blast that a bombing was either suspected or known to be following.

Reference 18 February edition; Sihanouk Threatens to Seek Alliance with North Vietnamese. You will note the picture of Cambodian Chief of State Prince Norodom Sihanouk inspecting Russian Mig-17 jet fighters. The article quotes Prince Sihanouk as saying "We will not help North Vietnam in its struggle against South Vietnam and will not favor the Vietcong but in case North Vietnam is attacked, Cambodia will war at her (North Vietnam's) side and vice versa." Another alleged incident such as happened when a Cambodian village was bombed by the Vietnamese Air Force could touch off another incident such as Korea.

On page 2 you will notice that some 12,000 persons are being treated for starvation in hospitals overflowing with patients, and emergency camps set up by the Indonesian Government. At the same time you will note on page 5 an article about the AFL-CIO dockworkers boycotting the shipment of grain to Russia. There seems to be a strange contrast between a famine in Indonesia and the sale by the U.S. Government of wheat to Russia. I had previously considered the Indonesians to be friendly to the United States. I wonder if this action won't leave a bad

taste in the mouths of the peoples of other southeast Asian countries. Also on page 5 I note the Russians are borrowing a half billion dollars from Great Britain. Do you think that in the complexity of international economics that we may in the long run be paying for the wheat which we sold to the Russians?

The 76 or more American casualties in an 8-day period plus a compounding of the aforementioned incidents, plus many other questionable acts of late, cause grave concern in the minds of many of us serving in this area. I might well imagine this concern is shared by many others in the United States as well as abroad.

Had this been even 1 year ago, I would have written the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California. I have always had the utmost respect and admiration for him. I do not know the status of Mr. ENGLE, as news is rather limited from the States. Just before I left the States in August he had just been operated on for a brain tumor, and the press releases at that time indicated that he would never be able to fill his office again. I was indeed sorry to hear this.

I consider home to be Red Bluff, Calif. Currently my wife and three children are living in Maxwell, Calif. I have been in the U.S. Air Force for about 12 years and am planning to continue my service, making this my career.

I do not make a habit of writing Senators, sir. In fact, I probably hate letter writing more than most people, but I feel so strongly about these matters that I felt it my duty to write and express my opinion. I decided upon you to write to, as I have requested assignment in the State of Oregon upon termination of my tour of duty here in South Vietnam. I have requested duty at Kingsley Field at Klamath Falls, Oreg.

Sir, I appreciate your indulgence in these matters and sincerely hope that you do not take offense to these opinions and observations which I have stated. I personally feel much better having written you, and, so to speak, getting these matters off my chest.

Yours truly,

Mr. President, that letter is an interesting sampling of mail dealing with the South Vietnam problem. As I have said, it is only a small portion of my mail. From time to time, in the exercise of the right to petition, I shall make known the views of these free American citizens, at least for history, by putting them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I could think of no better use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than to carry out the right of free Americans to petition their Government. From time to time this week I shall have a few other things to say on the South Vietnam problem, because I wish to make perfectly clear that the senior Senator from Oregon does not intend to let the McNamara war in South Vietnam be conducted without strong dissent in the Senate.

I have merely a sampling of the mail from Oregon. There have been Senators who have wondered what reception the people in Oregon would take to the position I have taken on foreign policy. I will stand ready and willing to submit my position on any major issue to a referendum in my State. There is no doubt in my mind what the overwhelming majority of the people in my State think of this unfortunate McNamara war in South Vietnam. So, for the benefit of some Senators who have expressed concern about the matter, I have placed a

few of the Oregon letters in the RECORD. The letters are typical.

I am satisfied that as more and more of the ugly facts about the McNamara war in South Vietnam become known to the American people, they will make perfectly clear, as I said at the beginning of my speech, that this administration had better bring an end to the McNamara war in South Vietnam by proceeding to carry out our obligations under existing treaties, including the SEATO treaty and the United Nations Charter, and to recognize that there is no justification whatsoever for unilateral U.S. action in South Vietnam. If there is to be any action in South Vietnam from any source or forces outside of South Vietnam itself, it ought to be by way of joint action carried on under existing rules of international law and procedure as provided for in existing treaties, pacts and charters, such as the United Nations

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HART, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2703) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the equitable treatment of Great Lakes ports, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITION OF GREAT LAKES PORTS TO PROGRAM OF SUBSIDIES UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides for the program of operating and construction subsidies which permit American Flag steamship operators and domestic shipyards to compete with the low-cost foreign flag competitors. This act has been of significant value in helping to build, and maintain our American merchant marine.

The 1936 act spelled out the Atlantic Gulf and Pacific coastal areas for particular consideration. That was 1936. Today we find the physical facts somewhat changed. The Great Lakes are open to ocean fleets of the world; it is our fourth seacoast. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959, the merchant fleets of the world have complete access to our great midcontinent area.

Last month I had the privilege of presiding at field hearings in Michigan, held by the Special Senate Subcommittee on Seaway Problems, chaired by the senior Senator from Ohio.

It became evident in testimony that American merchant ships are not using the seaway in sufficient numbers, and there may be several reasons why that is so.

The Merchant Marine Act—because it predates the seaway—inadvertently discriminates against American-flag ships in the Great Lakes ports. Meanwhile, foreign-flag lines are moving in and monopolizing the various trades.

This is a serious detriment to our foreign trade in general, and to the trade of the Great Lakes ports in particular.

We are not talking about an isolated area; this North American midcontinent area is the heartland of the entire North American Hemisphere. It comprises only 18 percent of the United States-Canada area, but 30 percent of the population, over 36 percent of the value added by manufacturer and over 42 percent of the income from all farm products.

In manufacturing, this area produces 53 percent of the transportation equipment, 51 percent of nonelectrical machinery, 45 percent of fabricated metal products, and 44 percent of the rubber and plastic products, and primary metal industry products. In agriculture, this area produces 85 percent of the flaxseed, 81 percent of the corn, 75 percent of the oats, 74 percent of the soybeans, 73 percent of the wheat and rye, 72 percent of the hogs, and over 40 percent of the poultry, milk cows, and sorghums.

This midcontinent area is a region unique in the history of man, unique in continental development, because the interior has surpassed the coastal periphery. This heartland that the Seaway opened to the world has surpassed the east coast, the East, the Mid-Atlantic, New England, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces of Canada—totaled—not only in agriculture and in population, but also in industrial production and employment.

The valid objectives of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act in assisting American flag steamship operators and domestic shipyards to compete with the low cost foreign flag operators must not be limited to the three historical coastal areas. Our new seacoast must be recognized. We must include the Great Lakes not only in our thinking about coastal areas, but in our laws affecting coastal areas.

Where the 1936 Merchant Marine Act specifically mentions the Atlantic, gulf and Pacific coasts for consideration of these subsidies we must now include the Great Lakes. It is the compelling claim and principle of equality that I want recognized and applied. It is not the intention of the legislation which I am introducing to limit any privileges now enjoyed at the historic seaboard, but merely to extend these privileges to the Great Lakes, a seaboard in fact and entitled to equal treatment.

At a time when the United States is in the midst of a major export drive, and when our national defense requires a strong American merchant marine, advantage must be taken of all our resources and economic facts of life should be acknowledged. The export origin studies of 1960 established that 34 percent of all exports of U.S.-manufactured goods originated in this seaway hinterland. If we are to place these goods in foreign markets at a cost that will allow

American business to compete, we must develop American-flag steamship companies orientated to the Great Lakes.

There must be developed a segment of the American Merchant Marine that is directed and dedicated to the development of Great Lakes commerce. It is to pave the way for such development that I today introduce legislation that will amend the 1936 Merchant Marine Act so that the Great Lakes will receive equal consideration with the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts.

We must not remain wedded to ancient history. We must take advantage of the present so that we might progress in the future. In essence, the United States is now engaged in a make-or-break struggle to maintain our international competitive position. We must take every advantage of our industrial-agricultural potential, and our most productive ground is where the production is.

Not to grant the Great Lakes area equal consideration with our historical seaboard areas would be a foolhardy rejection of the economic facts of life.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, and be appropriately referred. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter dated March 24, 1964, from Otto C. Krohn, divisional manager of Wickes Marine Terminal Co., of Bay City, Mich. The letter gives sharp meaning to the problems which I ask the Senate to resolve by prompt consideration of the proposed legislation I now introduce.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICKES MARINE TERMINAL CO.,
Bay City, Mich., March 24, 1964.

Senator PHIL HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: On March 19 the USDA issued announcement Gr-407 supplement No. 15 calling for bids for dry edible peas and/or pinto beans.

You recently conducted hearings in Michigan concerning problems of seaway shipping. Here is a case in point.

The USDA is requesting offers for 1,000 tons of beans f.a.s., vessel for Puerto Rico to be shipped approximately the 8th of May. Only American-flag vessels are permitted traffic between U.S. ports and Puerto Rico. There are no American-flag vessels plying this trade from the lakes. We are confident that a foreign-flag vessel could be induced to carry this tonnage from the lakes to Puerto Rico.

These beans will no doubt be shipped to Puerto Rico rail from Michigan to Baltimore then on American-flag vessels from Baltimore to Puerto Rico. The excess rail freight to Baltimore compared with Michigan ports would probably exceed \$11,000.

We thought this information would be of interest to you.

Very truly yours,

OTTO C. KROHN,
Divisional Manager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2703) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the equitable treatment of Great Lakes ports, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 211(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1121(a)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and with the further added consideration of the benefits to the foreign commerce of the United States of each domestic seacoast, Atlantic, gulf, Pacific, and Great Lakes, being provided services primarily interested in and devoted to the development and fostering of the commerce of that seacoast".

Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 809 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1213) is amended by striking out "and Pacific" and inserting in lieu thereof "Pacific, and Great Lakes".

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 31, 1964, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 30, 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William McCormick Blair, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

Mrs. Katharine Elkus White, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Dorothy H. Jacobson, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30, 1964:

U.S. COAST GUARD

Carl W. Sehn, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy as an instructor with the grade of lieutenant commander.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1970.